

THE

AMERICAN

PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

EDITORS:

HENRY B. SMITH AND J. M. SHERWOOD.

*Associate Editors:*ALBERT BARNES,
THOMAS BRAINERD, } Philadelphia.

ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.

JONATHAN B. CONDIT, Auburn Theological Seminary, N. Y.

GEORGE E. DAY, Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, O.

JULY, 1866.

NEW YORK:

WILLIAM SHERWOOD, No. 654 BROADWAY,

(At the Book Store of CHARLES SCRIBNER & Co.)

PHILADELPHIA:

PRESBYTERIAN BOOKSTORE, 1834 CHESTNUT STREET.

BOSTON: A. WILLIAMS & CO.

PRINT IN BINDING

GOULD & LINCOLN, PUBLISHERS & BOOKSELLERS,

59 Washington Street, Boston,

Respectfully invite Clergymen to visit their

Book Establishment.

GOULD & LINCOLN

Would invite special attention to their extensive list of publications (several new volumes just issued), embracing valuable works in Theology, Science, Literature, and Art; Text-Books for Schools, Colleges and Theological Institutions; Miscellaneous and Juvenile Works, etc., in large variety; the production of many of the ablest writers, and most scientific men of the age, among whom will be found Sir William Hamilton, George Rawlinson, Hugh Miller, Samuel Hopkins, Prof. Masson, Prof. Mansel, Ellicott, Wescott, Bayne, Chambers, Gosse, Geo. P. Marsh, Agassiz, Gould, Guyot, Marcou, Dr. Wayland, Dr. Williams, Dr. Hopkins, Dr. Ide, Dr. Peabody, Dr. Haven, Dr. Harris, Dr. Turnbull, Dr. Ripley, Dr. Kitto, Dr. Hackett, Dr. Stow, Dr. Adams, Dr. Sprague, Dr. Pattison, Dr. Thompson, Dr. Hague, Dr. Phelps, Dr. Anderson, Dr. Eadie, Dr. Buchanan, Dr. Hovey, Dr. Tweedie, Dr. Chaplin, Newcomb, Banvard, Bungener, Miall, Archdeacon Hare, John Foster, Krummacher, and others of like standing and popularity.

They also keep, in addition to works published by themselves, an extensive assortment of works in all departments of Trade, which they supply at publisher's prices.

Particular attention is paid to the selection and furnishing of **Minister's Libraries, Public Libraries, Family Libraries,** and

SABBATH-SCHOOL LIBRARIES.

BIBLES

English and American, in variety, at low prices.

Any work on their list forwarded per mail (post paid), on reception of the price.

ALL ORDERS PROMPTLY ATTENDED TO.

WORKS JUST ISSUED:

SCRIPTURAL LAW OF DIVORCE. By ALVAH HOVEY, D. D., Prof. Newton Theological Institution. 16mo, cloth, 67 cents.

MASSACHUSETT'S ECCLESIASTICAL LAW. By EDWARD BUCK, Esq., of the Suffolk Bar. 12mo, cloth, \$1 75.

WAYLAND'S MORAL SCIENCE (new edition). 12mo, cloth, \$1 75.

The last literary labor performed by Dr. Wayland, previous to his death, was the complete and thorough revision of the above popular work.

CHRISTIAN'S DAILY TREASURY, a Religious Exercise for every day in the year. By Rev. E. TEMPLE. 12mo, cloth, \$1 50.

BATTLE ECHOES; or Thoughts suggested by the late Civil War. By GEORGE B. LEE, D. D. 12mo, cloth, \$1 75.

IN PRESS.

MEMOIR OF GEORGE N. BRIGGS, LL. D., late Governor of Massachusetts. By Rev. W. C. RICHARDS. With Illustrations. Royal 12mo.

new
ure,
accel-
the
ound
Prof.
rsh,
Ide,
Dr.
Dr.
Dr.
lare,
e as-
her's
bra-

e.

Theo-

e Su-

imple-

year

son B

s. B

a
v
h
fa
b
co
fe
as
ca

new
ature,
scel-
f the
ound
Prof.
arsh,
Ide,
Dr.
Dr.
Dr.
hare,
e as-
her's
bra-

e.

Theol-

e Suf-

plete

year.

ow R.

By

THE
AMERICAN
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

NEW SERIES. No. XV.—JULY, 1866.

ART. I.—THE BEING OF GOD.

By MILES P. SQUIER, D.D., Geneva, N. Y.

THE existence of God is a fundamental subject of thought. Nothing underlies it or goes before. All theology and moral science arise out of, and depend upon it. If God be not, then nothing is. All else must be resultant of him, and take on the postulate that he is. How can the finite be but by reason of the infinite, the created but by the uncreated, the dependent but by the independent, the conditioned but by the absolute and eternal?

Investigations in theology and moral truth have been much at fault here. They have shown weakness and equivocation, where of right belonged manhood and strength. The subject has not had justice at the hands of its friends. We have failed in method and in cogency of argument, in the reliability and comprehensiveness of our positions, in the resources and completeness of our logic and convictions. We have felt as if the theory of truth here was involved and intricate; as if the thread of the Sybil conducted us through dark and cavernous passages, and along by-ways which we knew not;

that there water was too deep for us, and that we must here pass from the sphere of knowledge into that of simple faith.

In this direction the English mind has taken the lead. Sir William Hamilton has formally stated "that the *knowledge* of God is impossible," in his article on the "Unconditioned"—a position which has been laboriously supplemented by Dr. Mansel, of Oxford, in his *Limits of Religious Thought*. The natural effect of such counsels is to beleaguer conscience and embarrass faith, and set men free from the obligations of religion. And the seed has already borne its legitimate fruit. This is observable in the new impulses and encouragement of "*Positive Science*" on the one hand, and of philosophic atheism and infidelity on the other. What else could be expected? Men will not forswear their intelligence. They will not be religious by prescription, or believe beyond the limits of rational conviction. They will not consent to this divorce between reason and faith; and if attempted by those who should assist their faith, they will only choose their own alternative, and repudiate a creed that does not take the intellect into its conclusions, and build its economy of belief on those enduring principles and first truths which are common to all safe and satisfactory inquiry in other departments of knowledge. Indeed, the conscience should have special help here, in view of the "law in the members," warring against the "law in the mind." It is suicidal to put reason and conscience in antagonism, or reason and faith. And yet this has been the anomaly and perturbation of our theology hitherto, and its false mission to the thinking classes of men. France turned infidel by reason of the unappreciable mummeries of the Romish faith. The Tractarianism of Oxford gives ominous signs of a like reaction. Error germinates in the twilight of conviction, and grows rank in the oscillations and tergiversations of truth.

But why found religion in mysticism, and put its chief elements beyond limits of human thought? Was it not designed for man, and man for it. Should it not inhere in the principles of common sense, and be like the sunlight—for all, and

adapted to all? It is false humility to say that we cannot know God, and that he cannot make himself *known* to us, and that the reason he has given us is not the offspring and counterpart of his own—made in his likeness, and adapted to intelligent correspondence with himself.

St. Paul was a philosopher as well as a Christian; and in a single sentence has he scattered to the winds all this timorousness and misgiving in respect to the elements of religious belief, and brought the whole subject into relation to the human mind, and incorporated it among the legitimate subjects of our knowledge and conviction, and declared our ignorance of it to be without excuse. Rom. i. 20: "For the invisible things of him (God) from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." This passage is very emphatic. Its statements and positions are comprehensive. Its averments are characteristic and unequivocal. They go the full length demanded for the proof of the being and perfections of God, and account the belief in God to be so obvious and obligatory in its apprehension and requisition, that the heathen even are inexcusable for not recognizing the true Jehovah, and worshiping, loving and serving him as such. The apostle waits for no special economy to reveal God to his creatures, but proclaims him manifested in his works, his being, his eternity and Godhead. All is clearly *seen*—intuitively beheld, and obviously implied and understood, in the legitimate apprehension of the mind from things that are made. "Eternal power" implies eternal existence; that is, uncreated, absolute existence. And then there is the embodiment of the whole grand idea of the "Godhead," as manifested in his works, as *clearly* beheld, as undeniably apprehended and understood. The reference in the passage is to the one true God, with his divine perfections, as thus known in reason, and clearly seen by the intelligence—the invisible things of him—the eternal potentiality and proper "Godhead" of the Deity.

On the basis here referred to, and in the light of the clear

convictions of the apostle, we propose to give the proof of the being of God.

1. *Something is.* This is the testimony of reason, of consciousness, and of the senses. There is infallible truth in this position. If I think, I am ; for only that which is, can think. How can we have secondary phenomena without the primary, or actions and words without being and thought?

We are conscious both of acting and of being. Some good writers have given up this last position, but without sufficient reason. There is in the soul a consciousness of existing as well as of acting, of being as well as behaving. This consciousness of self as being and acting is infallible in its instruction, that something is—that we ourselves are, and have faculties and powers, convictions and feelings, intelligence, emotions and passions, observation and experience. In no other way could knowledge be more infallible, or be possible independent of it; and it is worse than idle to call in question the universal and necessary convictions of humanity on this point.

The senses, too, are sure sources and media of instruction; and we distinguish the "me" from the "not me." The eye, the ear, the touch, the taste, the smell, all are channels of knowledge to us from an external world, and methods of our access to it and communion with it. Only by these and like ways could we be put in communication with material objects, and become cognizant of the universe around us. And this linking of the "me" to the "not me" of external nature is a wonderful economy, yet fully authenticated.

Thus we have various means of coming to the knowledge that something is. We are; others are; suns and planets are, and all the universal cosmos of created things. This we may affirm with the certainty of clearly apprehended truth, without troubling ourselves with speculations about the presentative or representative methods of inquiry. Science and common sense agree here. This conviction comes to us with a thousand voices, from within and without, as the universal language of humanity, so that we need not prolong an argument in proof of that which every one feels and knows.

2. *Effects are.* We do not need to prove that man did not create the sun, or himself, or anything else. We know he did not. It is an undeniable position. And yet there are effects. The intelligence sees them to be so. Matter is; and it is meted, bounded and limited, and must have been meted, bounded and limited by what was outside and independent of itself. It is, because it was made to be, and was put into existence by a power before and extraneous to itself. It is, as it is, and where it is, by reason of something else. At most, it is but a "*causa causata*." We see it to be, and to contain only the "*vis inertia*." It is finite, and some being must have made it. It is a creation, and in itself an inert effect. Philosophy and common sense, reason and revelation, intelligence and the senses, agree in affirming this. We arrive at it as surely as we do at the truth, that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts; that matter exists in space, and events in time; and that he who acts, is.

Men dive deeper than the truth sometimes, and show themselves more like muck-worms than philosophers. All science takes rise in the intuitions of the intelligence. Demonstration is in aid of intuitional apprehension. The first truths of reason need no demonstration; they are intuitionally self-evident; they are infallibly seen in the mind's own light. Why undertake to prove to me that which already is a matter of my own consciousness, or which exists with the certainty of infallibly implied truth in the dictates of the intelligence? Why devote an argument to prove that matter exists in space, or that events occur in time, or that effects imply a cause, or action an actor, or thinking a being that thinks?

Intuition is the test of truth, and the arbiter of knowledge. But for this, demonstration would be without conviction, and logic valueless and impossible. What satisfaction can we get from any efforts of logic beyond the insight of our minds, of the truth as reasoned out or stated? Thus all knowledge and conviction, on the last analysis, arise out of, and are resolved into, intuitions. And they must begin in self-evident principles of truth. We apprehend them in the insight of the in-

telligence, and advance from them, and but for them advance would be impossible. They are not proved, but seen in their own light, by the insight of reason.

This is not faith, though faith and trust in the things thus seen and signified is consequent and reasonable. It is not testimony to us, but apprehension by us. It is not testimony from the senses, but it is perception by them. It is apprehension and knowledge through them. It is the insight of the intelligence in the only possible way of consciousness and sense; and we believe the things thus made known, for the best of reasons, because we see them to be true. We take testimony from others and use it for what it is worth, but here we see and have the original types and methods of knowledge, and give them credence as such. And we perceive that matter is effect, and recognize it as merely inert, unconscious, impersonal effect, without sense or reason, and appropriate and use it as such. It is created, and not absolute in its being; it is, because it was made, to be, and could not have been otherwise; and if we deny the intuitions of mind in this, then is all knowledge impossible, and science a misnomer from the beginning.

So in the sphere of mind, though here we rise above nature, and take in the peculiar elements of the supernatural. Mind is cause *per se*, and yet but a limited, finite, created, dependent cause in us. It has no creative power, and must itself have been created. It is itself an effect, finite and dependent in its being and power. It could not create one particle of the dust of the earth. It had a beginning, and a creation, and puts on all the types of dependence, responsibility and allegiance. It is consciously an effect, and humble in its dependence, as the offspring of one who created and upholds and sustains all things.

3. *Something always was.* This follows infallibly from the fact that something is. How get the existent, without the ever-existent? How get the effect, without the cause? The scale of dependent causes does not help you. You must reach an original cause, which is in no sense an effect. Any

and all effects show this. The philosophic Paul saw this, and leaped at once, in his convictions and his argument, from the creation to an *eternal* Power, and with the utmost legitimacy and infallibility. We care not how difficult may be the idea of the always being; it is inevitable. Either deny everything, or admit that. If effects are, there is eternal cause. If anything is, something always was. You get your whole doctrine from the least mote as completely as from the largest universe. Nothing could be, unless something always was. That which had a beginning is an effect, and had a cause above and before it. That which began, is by reason of that which did not begin. Dependence proves independence; the derived, the underived; the created, the uncreated and absolute. You must accept, absolute, uncreated, eternal being, as the only stand-point for the existence of anything else. It is our inevitable postulate, if effects are, and the creation is. But these are, and there is a cosmos. As you cannot deny the one, neither can you the other. The logic is inexorable, the philosophy without mistake, the insight of reason obvious and perfect. You get the derived finite, by means of the underived infinite. The (*αἰών*), the always being, is the necessary complement of the doctrine of every being, action and thought. You can have nothing, or think of nothing, that does not involve it. The full and adequate conception of the *always being*, "without beginning of days or end of years," may not be expected of derived mind. We are an effect, and abide in the region and sphere of effects, and find it difficult to grasp that which is only cause, and itself uncaused. But that it is, admits of no doubt, "being clearly seen by things that are made"—and we repeat the thought.

4. *The always-being is eternal cause.* The always existing could be in no sense an effect, or find the reason and ground of its being in something else. Nothing else existed, to take on this relation to it. Its existence, like that of duration and space, is from eternity to eternity, "the same yesterday, to-day and forever," and is inherent cause. Whatever else exists is originated by this, and exists by its creative fiat. In

the existence of this, you reach the necessary ultimum of being, as cause of all conception concerning it. Nothing is possible or conceivable beyond. The ultimate idea is eternal existence, as eternal, original cause—the originator of all else; but itself without origination and without beginning, and like space and duration, boundless, ceaseless. It simply is, and acts. We may not, in our sphere of derived existence, and under the laws of thought that must obtain in the region of cause and effect, be able to gain the full contents of such existence; but that it is, we infallibly know. We get it as a first truth of reason, from the laws of the intelligence, and the inevitable logic of the case. More we could not have; less there could not be, if even a mote or an atom exists.

5. *The always-being, the eternal cause, is INTELLIGENT cause.* Matter exists only as effect: its “vis inertia” is proved by the insight of reason and the senses. Mind only is cause, and is seen to be cause, by the dictate of consciousness. It may be dependent for its being, as in the case of finite, derived mind, but has in it the elements of inherent cause, in its self-activity and prerogatives of free-will. It has free personality, and the self-felt, and self-acknowledged power of causation and choice. It is a “causa causans.” All intelligence is such, and it is all the proper cause of which we know. If other modes of being are possible, they are not known or knowable, and are without relevancy or significance in this discussion, and could no way affect our position.

Intelligence, then, is the characteristic of the eternal cause. It is so “a fortiori.” This is infinite, absolute mind, having in itself the elements of all power and cause. Mind has everywhere homogeneous characteristics and manifestations. It must have intellect, sensibility and will. These are integral to it, and include all that belong to it, or that is conceivable as in it. We may go from derived mind to the underived, and obtain from conscious manifestations, the elements of both. From what is in, and belongs to derived, dependent mind, we recognize what belongs to independent, absolute mind. The one is a derivative from the other, and like it, and

in correspondence with it. The forthgoings of the absolute will be in the direction of its own being, in giving birth to mind, and constituting it the offspring of its author. There will be mutual similarity and appreciation. They will correspond with each other, and we pass from the known to the unknown, as we step by the moon into the visible heavens. We legitimately take the chronological or the logical method, and pass from effect to cause, and from cause to effect, and we see in the eternal cause, not the reflection merely of our own intelligence, and mental constitution and energy, but the absolute and unfailing source and fullness of it. We come to the fountain head of all being, intelligence, and power. We arrive at the original, unlimited, independent cause; at the infinite mind, which was before all else, and by which all else exists. And we get this with the infallible certainty of demonstrative truth. We get the doctrine in consciousness, and by the light of our own intelligence, and we refer it legitimately, in its relations, to the original, absolute cause. There is firm footing. Intelligent cause finds its fullness and perfection in the original, eternal cause, and we behold in it the grand primal element, and authorship of all else. There is "the hiding" of power, and there the counterpart and depository of the intellectual characteristics, energies and manifestations of a created universe.

6. *The always-being is* RIGHTEOUS cause. Here we rise into the moral bearings of our subject more appropriately, and enter a sphere of truth that is thought to be less ascertained and obvious. We may then proceed with special caution, and be more deliberate in the conclusions to which we come, and we throw into the foreground of our position the following summary of thought comprised in it, as we ask, Is not rectitude the normal mode and state of the intelligence? Is not sin an apostasy from right? Could malevolence and wrong have an object in an independent, absolute, intelligent cause? What is the doctrine of conscience and of reason? What is the instruction of fact in the case? We may review these inquiries a little in detail, and see with what united force they

bear on the position, that the intelligent, eternal cause exists in eternal rectitude and truth. •

(1) *Rectitude is the normal status of intelligence everywhere.* Mind is constituted in its elements and inherently adapted to right action under the influence of truth. Its nativity and growth, and harmony of being are in all righteousness, goodness and love. It feels outraged and wronged when committed to any other course. Its indigenous principles have their natural development, and play, and outgrowth, and consent of action in all goodness, and justice, and truth. Wrong grates harsh thunder in the chambers of the soul, and throws it into a state of uneasiness, self-accusation and discord. Wrong is essentially abnormal to the intelligence. It puts it out of gear in itself, and with all things else. It is an interference and a disruption. There is not an intelligent being that truly fellowships wrong, and that does not feel humiliated by it, or that is not ashamed of it, and that seeks not apology and excuse for it. Its presence begets self-reproach and a sense of guilt and unworthiness. Its indulgence brings on antagonism and warfare. It is unreason, as well as unrighteousness. It is without occasion, and without excuse. It is out of harmony with truth and the nature of things, and an apple of discord everywhere. It is so in the individual, in society, and through the universe. It is intellectual and moral disruption, suicide and ruin, and it would not be the status of original, absolute cause, or of anything made in its image.

(2) *Sin can be only by apostasy from right.* There is a logical difficulty in the way of conceiving wrong to be the normal state of the intelligence. Sin is transgression. It supposes law, and right, and righteous authority, and the behests of goodness and truth. Moral government is before it. It finds a nature of things established,—an order of being, to which it is disruption and discord. It is logically abnormal, and by priority of right. It is apostasy from the original, absolute cause, and cannot be of it, or possess its moral nature. It is dereliction and antagonism, and could not be in unity and agreement with the truth and verity of things.

But there is no opportunity or possibility of change, or apostasy in absolute cause. The conception of change would reduce it to limited, finite effect, and divest it of all elements of original, absolute cause. Besides, what should change it? and from what should it apostatize, but from itself? It has all knowledge and power always, and has in it no ground of change. This is conceivable in intelligent beings, only by change of view, by new considerations, through increase of knowledge, and the pressure of motives not before in the mind. Change has its genesis and analysis in the altered state, or circumstances of the being changed. This is a liability of derived, finite mind, which of necessity begins in ignorance, weakness and inexperience. It begins at the zero of knowledge, for knowledge is an experience, and not a creation. But, to it are confined all the attributes, incidents, and grounds of change. To the all-knowing absolute, they are impossible. "He is of one mind, and none can turn him. Changes in him would not be of the nature of intelligent action. The highest freedom would make it ever certain that he would be unalterably the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever." Change in finite mind will occasion change of treatment from the absolute, but this is only because of its own oneness and immutability. It will have moral government, for it is itself intelligent cause, and will administer it in perfect righteousness from its own inherent perfections. Such a government, so administered, is a perfectness on the part of absolute cause. Nothing else could be better, or be in its stead. This only is conceivable or possible in the absolute, and perfect freedom of absolute, intelligent cause. This is of its image, and in its likeness, and will be its method and forthcoming.

(3) *Malevolence would be without an object in original, absolute cause.* It would not be intelligent action there, and could have no place. Malevolence implies resistance, controversy, and ill-will. It is a normal state nowhere, and would have nothing to feed on in the absolute course. Simple goodness is not in itself an object of hate to any intelligence. Righteous authority must come in our way, and set up its claims on

us, when we have got off the track of obedience, or have resolved to serve ourselves, and have our own way ; to be resisted and impugned by us. Sin is shy and apologetic. No one accepts it for its own sake. It has the verdict of no intelligent being in the universe. All are ashamed of it, and tender excuse for it, and seek to justify themselves in some way for its indulgence. "The wicked flee when no man pursueth, but the righteous are bold as a lion."

But what occasion has absolute cause for all this, and to turn to the deceits and craft of ungodliness? Wrong would have no object or apology there, and must be forever without ground or possibility. It is independent. It intuitionally knows all things, and is from eternity to eternity the same. It must recognize truth, and right, and blessing, as the only reason, and the opposite as only unreason and folly. Sin is always so, and absolute cause would see it, and thus regard it, and be at a perfect remove from it. It is conceivable only in the finite, and there only in misguided, mistaken, and perverse will.

(4) We advert to the *doctrine of conscience and the nature of mind*. The thought here is intimately blended with what has been already said. Mind is made for truth, and truth adapted to it. The conscience, with fair opportunity, corresponds to all righteousness, and eschews all wrong. It has a scorpion's sting for him who practices iniquity. It repudiates all wrong, and makes the way of the transgressor hard. Thus writes our great English dramatist :

"Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just."

—" 'Tis conscience that makes cowards of us all."

—"The thief doth esteem each bush an officer."

So again, on the other hand,

"I feel within me

A peace above all earthly dignities,

A still and quiet conscience."

Sin seeks twilight and evasion. It is inconsistent and out of harmony with all mind, and is every way abnormal to the

innate principles of the intelligence. The greatest of modern scholars (Neander) has called it simply "unreason," and with this agrees all fact in the case. We know nothing of wrong but through apostasy. We have only to cease from it, in penitence and reformation, to recover our normal state, and put the powers of the soul into consent and harmony. All history agrees in this. The conflicts of the ages demonstrates this, and the sentiments, aspirations, and progress of the race. What is the advancing civilization of the world but a recovery, a resurrection, a plea, in behalf of associated humanity, as well as individual man, for that "righteousness which exalteth a nation, and against the sin which is a reproach unto any people."

But we do need more to evince the innate, moral rectitude of the absolute cause. It is the doctrine of all science and truth, of all logic and reason, and inevitable from the nature and history of mind.

7. *The always-being is infinite cause.* What shall limit it, and put it into the finite, and give it metes and bounds? Nothing is before it, or superior to it, or correlative with it. It must be unlimited and boundless, as are space and duration. To put it into the finite reduces it to a mere effect, subject to the accidents of time. The thing would only be absurd, and involve the denial of absolute cause altogether.

It may be difficult, and perhaps impossible, for us fully to grasp the contents embraced in infinite cause. The nature of thought and speech would seem to forbid it. We are derived beings and exist in the finite. Language is earthly and finite in its composition and history. It is essentially analogical. Our conceptions rise from the known to the unknown. We compare the infinite with the finite, and strive after the apprehension of it through that medium. They are not correlates. The infinite is a conception of the *pure reason*. It is apprehended through a negation of the qualities of the finite, as effect, and as existing by necessity, from the fact that the finite exists. It is the logical antecedent of it, and must be, if the finite is, and must be apprehended to be by the intelli-

gence, as the alone condition of the finite ;—"being clearly *seen* by the things that are made, even its eternal power and godhead."

The infinite is, so to speak, the normal type of being. The finite is limited, partial and fragmentary it may be,—changing and evanescent, and exists by no necessary law. It has the eharacteristic or accident of more or less. It is the product of free will, and might not have been at all. It is the exception, and not the rule of being. Infinite existence was without it. It is in quality and amount only what it was made to be, by the creative fiat of eternal cause :—a few billions of worlds, perhaps, with people and products, their habitudes and mutations, their accidents and results. The grand law of being is in the ever-existing, unchanging, infinite.

It is difficult for us to conceive of either mode of being, and of the one no less than of the other. The finite is effect, and could exist only by reason of the infinite, and as its product. The doctrine of cause generates, necessitates the existence of the underived infinite. The finite is, by reason of the infinite and can only thus be, to give it being, and the qualities of finite existence. Finite it will be of course, it being created, and proclaims its logical antecedent and creator, in that which is not created or finite. It springs out of that as the offspring and manifestation of it, and its constant work.

Of the infinitude of original cause, it is enough for our position that we conceive of it, as we do of space and duration, as every way limitless and without bounds ; or dependence or change, as in no way effect, but existing eternally as the same ubiquitous cause.

8. *The always-being, is self-existent, perfect being.* It depends on nothing else. It exists in self-sufficiency and perfection ; independent and without imperfection in any respect. Imperfection is characteristic of the finite and dependent. Decay and change are its liabilities. It is subject to outside influences. It has been put into being and may be put out. It is not raised above a state of dependence : it could not be. Not so the great first cause. These elements would reduce it to an

effect, and put it in the finite. It must have been perfect in all respects, indestructible and exhaustless, or it would have come to nought, or never have been. It can have no element of decadence, exhaustion or change. Every attribute of it, must of necessity be perfect in its kind, and eternally the same, without variableness or shadow of turning; and these attributes are those of wisdom, goodness, and power,—all perfection, both natural and moral, infinitely and forever. No thing other or different from this does the finite and created demand. If but a mote exist, all this is and must be true and always was. With perfect certainty and assurance we spring from the existence of a thought or an atom, to the existence of the uncreated, infinite, and eternal cause, with all the perfections of intellect and heart belonging to intelligent being.

9. *The always-being is God, the personal Jehovah, with all the attributes and prerogatives of the Godhead.* This is St. Paul's conclusion, and we arrive at it with the security and perfectness of pure truth. It has the infallibleness of a first truth of reason; clearly seen in the light of the intelligence itself.

Personality resides in the will. This is the executive faculty of intelligent being. It is cause and the only cause. Reason may be receptive only, and impersonal it may be in some of its aspects; the sensibility may be passive; but not so the will. That is the centralization of the personality, and the living and conscious agency of the mind. It is the life and energy of the acting, responsible agent. Here is where we abandon the abstract form of speech, and take the concrete. Here we give impersonation to our subject, and speak of cause as the investiture of the deity and the synonym of God, with all divine perfections infinitely, of both intellect and will. This is the "I AM" of Moses, and the Pentateuch, where it is referred to with philosophical exactness and comprehension. Accidental metaphysics cannot coin a more descriptive appellation. It is the always existing—the eternal present, embracing in a complete personality all the attributes and preroga-

tives of the one living and true God. It is revealed in the intelligence. Reason would cease her office not to observe it. Nothing is, or all this is. If any thing is, then God is, with all perfection of wisdom, power and goodness.

We need no special revelation to evince this, except as sin has obscured our vision. Indeed Moses must have accepted it as the dictate of reason, and known in the intelligence, and appealed to, as an indubitable first truth, for the verification of the message sent therewith. It must be the dictate of reason, or it would be no test or verification of the message, or of him by whom it is sent. It must be an undoubted first truth, or it could not thus be appealed to, or discharge its office in the connection. The process was wholly philosophical, passing from the known to the unknown. Thus the existence of God is nowhere made the subject of a communicated and verbal revelation: this it could not be. The conception of the being of God antedates, by necessity of relation, that of a revelation from him. One must have a friend, in order to hear from him, and recognize his being in accepting his communication. Thus a divine revelation will begin with stating the acts of God, and not with a disquisition to prove that he is. It will recognize everywhere his being, and make it the basis of its communications and declarations to the ignorant and misguided, as what they ought to know, and would, only as "through lust, they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, and changed the true God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forevermore."

Ignorance of God is an apostasy from the true and primeval knowledge of him. It is born of the lusts and vile affections of men, and is less allied to the head than the heart. God has not left himself without a witness in the intellect and conscience of man, and it is to that, that revelation appeals with its economy of instruction and grace. It is a restoration and recovery. It is needed only by reason of the fall, and has its design to gain us back into the harmony of our being, and into harmony with God.

Thus in review of our whole epitome of thought, the legitimacy of faith in the being of God is every way vindicated and obvious. It is the offspring of the intuitions of reason, and of inexorable logic. I believe in the existence of God as I do in that of anything else that I know to be. My faith, a confidence and trust in God, are the result of an intellectual apprehension of him, as of any other being, and not a baseless and unsustained sighing, or wish for that which we cannot "know." Faith is the result of evidence. It is the child of light in the understanding. The "Godhead" is clearly seen, through any manifestation in the finite. "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." We have such proof of his being and perfections, as we have of no one else. Our bodily organs do not apprehend the real being of any one: the recognition is wholly mental. And we have more relations to God than to any one else, and over and above all, the relation of dependence, by which we see that his existence is the necessary prerequisite of any person or thing else.

We hold then, and by the most rigid logic, and the most assured and unquestionable methods of the intelligence, that faith in God is of all things most reasonable, and is commended to us by every possible avenue of knowledge. Spirit, of course, is not matter, and yet if we accept the revelation given, it is quite capable of taking on the forms of matter, as is true of ourselves. Bodily organs do not apprehend spiritual being, but the mind for which they act, does, and sees it with the certainty and perfectness of direct consciousness and conception. The commerce of mind with mind is, of course, intellectual, but nevertheless is real and appreciable. God recognizes us, and we recognize him. He holds intercourse with us in the communion, and fellowship, and love, and all the reciprocities of the infinite with the finite, and we give back the like responses and their counterpart. Finite mind is an emanation from the infinite, and in its image, and like it in its properties. God can communicate with it, intelligently and it can understand him and reciprocate the intercourse. This is the behoof and privilege of all finite mind. For this

was it made, and in this is its highest prerogative, excellence and glory.

And here lies the sphere of intelligent being ;—God with us and we with him and with each other, in the three categories of all possible knowledge and relationship :—the infinite—the finite, and the relation between them.

On this basis faith becomes truly the dictate of reason and the form of it. It is intelligently the gift of God and the hand-maid of virtue. It receives meekly and with docility all divine communications, as not from an unknown source, but as from a known God and Father, who “has not left himself without witness,” or left us in our orphanage without light, seeing that “he is not far from every one of us, for in him we live, and move, and have our being.”

Nor in this do we unduly magnify the gift of reason, or the province of our intellectual being. What else would be true, or to be expected? If God be an infinitely perfect being, shall not that appear in his work, and especially in that crowning work of spiritual being in the finite? Shall it not be a respondent of the infinite reason and be capable of knowing as well as of loving and serving God? Must its devotion be to one unknown, and its worship be that of ignorance and mere dictation? How then could we be intelligent and responsible worshipers, or distinguish between truth and error in this department of knowledge? This power to know God is indispensable to both intelligence and morality. If we cannot know God, then by equal force of reasoning we cannot know other spiritual beings, and all sense of obligation and duty will fade from the mind.

Sir William Hamilton and his followers mistake the relations of faith, and inaugurate a nomenclature on this subject which only confuses and bewilders. It is not true that because we believe the senses, therefore they are not methods of knowledge. It is because they are methods of knowledge and loopholes of the mind, by which it looks out upon truth and sees what is, that we believe them. What are they but the mind thus surveying the domain of truth, and gaining the ma-

terials of knowledge? and when, with these hints from consciousness, or the senses, we pass into the region of pure truth, what is more conceivable than the necessary being, perfections and relations of God, and the love and service we owe him? The faith that is not founded in knowledge, and that does not take the intellect into its conclusion, must indeed be suppositions, and arbitrary, and by consequence shadowy and unsatisfying, and well would it have been if distinguished writers on this subject had analyzed it with greater patience and accuracy.

But enough of the brief recital of truth designed in this article; and we close as we began, with a reference to the philosophical, as well as inspired, St. Paul, who, in the first chapter of his Letter to the Romans, as elsewhere, seems to have measured in few words the height, and depth, and length, and breadth of this whole subject, and left, "without excuse," all wavering and doubt concerning it.

ART. II.—THE FULLNESS OF THE TIME.

By J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D. D., Prof. of Theology in the University of Utrecht.

Translated from the Dutch, by Rev. J. P. WESTERVELT, Princeton, N. J.

It is impossible for us to view in its proper light the appearance of the Son of God on earth, without having previously acquainted ourselves with the period in which he appeared on the stage of this world. An apostle of the Lord, who was accustomed to take a profound view of the development of God's counsel, has assured us that God sent his Son *in the fullness of the time*. It is our task to justify that declaration, and to make it, in the light of history, apparent, that the age

in which Jesus was born was eminently adapted to see the founder of the kingdom of God appear. A glance at the heathen, at the Jewish world, and at the mutual relation of both in the period of Augustus, will convince us as well of the susceptibility of humanity to the appearance of Christ, as serve to prepare the way for the explanation of the reception that he met with.*

On entering the heathen world, then, at the first superficial view, all seems to contradict the declaration that this field was ready to receive the seed of the kingdom. The most powerful nations, fettered and bent under the yoke of domination, adopt Rome's vices, and see, on the other hand, their own idols honored in the chief city of the ancient world. Among the conquerors luxury has ascended the throne, and the perilous art of enjoying life is refined and developed to a degree that seems, with its cultivators, to have deadened every feeling of necessity for something higher and better. Among the oppressed all elasticity seems departed, all courage extinguished, all higher life of the spirit crippled by the misery of the times. The schools of philosophy find numerous adherents, eloquent teachers, powerful patrons. The idol temples still stand well established, environed by a retinue of priests, visited by throngs of worshipers, protected by the power of the State against every assault. Is it, then, no partial prepossession for our Christian faith, when we call heathenism antiquated and exhausted? Is it not premature to maintain that under the blush of health we discover symptoms of decay and death on the countenance of the heathen

* Compare, besides what Neander, Gieseler and Hase, in the first period of church history, communicate on this important subject, Tholuck, *On the Being and Moral Influence of Heathenism*; Stürm, *Apologie des Christenth.*, (1836) *7e Brief*; Tzschirner, *Fall des Heidenth.*, edited by Niedner, 1st vol. (1829); Kuhn, *der Gegensatz des Heidenthums und des Christenth. in der sittlichen Weltansicht*, in the *Tüvinger Theol. Quartalschr.* 1841. II. S. 224-243; C. Schmidt, *Essai historique sur la Société civile dans le monde Romain et sur sa transformation par le Christianisme*, Strasb. 1853. Hagenbach, *Voort. over de gesch. d. Chr. Kerk gedurende de drie eerste eeuwen*, Rott. bl. 1-44, and especially Edm. de Pressensé, *Gesch. d. drie eerste eeuwen des Christend.* Utr. 1860, bl. 17-242, with the writers there cited. Finally, also, the important *Vorlesungen über neueste Zeitgeschichte*, of M. Schneckenburger, published after the death of the writer. Francf. 1862.

world? Let impartial history give the answer to these questions.

And then, as we glance at the *inward* condition of heathenism, we are at once struck with the developed *disbelief* in the truth of the same religion, which now more than ever seems to flourish. High was the degree of intellectual and moral refinement attained by many in this period. Philosophy had deeply felt and loudly acknowledged the absurdity of the earlier mythological representations; and the more the thinking spirit endeavored to penetrate the being of the Deity, the less could it acquiesce in the traditions and solemnities of the popular religion. The light kindled by Anaxagoras, Socrates, Plato, Zeno and others, shone not only on the initiated in their flourishing schools, but spread also its rays far and near in many houses and hearts of the people. Were there yet thousands who unreflectingly and servilely honored the earlier forms, they could not wholly close their ears and their hearts to the voice of truth that found so powerful an advocate in every one's understanding and conscience. A Plutarch, to whom none can deny moral and religious earnestness, was heard to assert "that, if the poetic doctrine of the gods must be literally understood, it must be spewed out of the mouth and publicly cursed." An Augustus dared affirm, "that Plato, who knew and earnestly censured the badness of the Grecian gods, much more deserved to be called God than those shameless ministers of sin." Strabo hesitated not to pronounce superstition a necessary evil, devised by statecraft, and only maintained by stupidity.* It is not, indeed, in itself so strange that voices against existing forms of religion make themselves heard. But that they are uttered so loudly; that they are not opposed but echoed; that those who raise them are regarded as the wisest and best men of their time, this already convinces us how greatly heathenism had, in the consciousness of countless numbers, outlived itself. A religion

* Plutarch *De Iside*, cap. 26. Augustinus, *De civ. Dei*, II. 14 Strabo, *Geogr.* 1, 2. Polyb. *Reliq.* VI. c. 56.

must indeed have sunk very low, above whose authority every intelligent man sought, as far as possible, to raise himself.

As faith is such a necessity of human nature as will take no denial, men cannot remain contented with unbelief. If no clear light arises on the inquiring mind, it enters on a new path of error, and loses itself in the mists of *superstition*. If ever history furnished for our contemplation a striking example of the truth uttered by Göthe: "Der Conflict des unglaublichs und Glaubens bleibt das einzige und tiefste Thema der Welt- und Menschengeschichte," it was in these times. Men fled from beings in which they scarcely believed; conscience drove the sinner back to the temples and altars, from which his understanding kept him at a distance, and whilst his mouth denied the existence of the gods, his hand employed magic means to protect himself against their influence, and his heart trembled by reason of the visions of the night. Thus very many spent their lives in disconsolate unrest, while the earth around them was hung in somber crape, and the heaven above was hid as by dark clouds from their view. Could there be a stronger incitement to urgent desires for purer light and fresher air?

Faith is the moral lever of our acts. It is not surprising, then, that the fruits of morality fail when the tree withers and dies on which they must grow. The *deepest immorality* characterized the heathen world. We should, indeed, go too far, were we to assert that virtue had entirely forsaken the earth, when God commanded deliverance from heaven. However deeply sunk, never could all mankind efface the last traces of their heavenly nobility. Had the higher life been wholly dead and buried, there had also been an end to the susceptibility of the nations to receive the light of a higher revelation. It would be unjust to gauge the depth to which, in general, morality had descended, by a Nero, Caligula, Messalina, and others. Civil virtues had, at Rome, been developed in high degree, and their whole posterity had not yet degenerated from former greatness. The moral strictness of the stoic school had not at once lost its influence. But is not

the high respect wherewith the age of Augustus mentions the names of a few noble spirits, a proof that they were exceptions from thousands, shining stars in a very dark night. It flowed from the nature of heathen religion, that the virtue it favored was extremely defective, the vice it fostered most alluring. The highest ideal of the Greeks, in their flourishing period, was æsthetic development; that of the Romans, political virtue and loyalty; but from the one stand-point pure morality, from the other true humanity, too often retired into the shade. Here moral turpitude was concealed and encouraged, and there was hardly a crime that found no extenuation or commendation in the conduct of the gods. There the crown of loyalty was the highest standard of human excellence, and every quiet virtue that did not enhance the national glory was regarded with the greatest contempt. Hence it was, that the female sex was oppressed, the lower classes trampled on, the moral education of children neglected. Humility was a virtue, in the fullest sense of the word unknown to heathenism, and self-sufficiency the principle of philosophy. What Cicero somewhere said,* "that we must expect success from the gods, but wisdom and virtue must be procured by our own strength," was the tacit hypothesis on which every system was constructed. Was the flourishing of morality, even in the fairest periods of ancient history, obstructed by such obstacles, how rapid must have been its decline when the sun of Greece's glory disappeared, and Rome, made giddy by the prosperity of universal dominion, sunk into a whirlpool of licentiousness. Such was the state of things in the days in which Christianity appeared. Pleasure mounted the throne, shame departed from the heart. "All"—to use the words of Seneca†—"was full of vice and crimes; more was done amiss than could by violence be made good. An unheard-of fight of wickedness is fought. From day to day love to sin increases, and men are under less re-

* De nat. Deorum, III. c. 36.

† De Ira, II. c. 8, 9. Compare the Satires of Juvenal and Persius.

straint. Vice no longer even conceals itself, but makes its appearance publicly. So greatly has wickedness become public, and inflamed the hearts of all, that innocence has not only become rare, but does not at all exist. If you desire the wise man to be angry in that measure which the turpitude of the crimes demands, he must then not only be angry, but even become mad with rage." We need not raise the veil behind which the most abominable sins were concealed; sufficient, that in public was practised what is not even mentioned without blushing. To those who doubt whether the disease of sin had penetrated deeply enough to make such an extraordinary remedy necessary, as that which Christianity announces, we only put the question, whether they can without shuddering contemplate even the possibility that that malady should have continued for centuries longer, and infected all the arteries of the great body of humanity? And however little disposed to pronounce the highly praised virtues of the ancients nothing else than splendid sins, we cannot, however, deny that an age which not only endured, but also flattered, admired and deified the most abominable monsters of wickedness, has disgraced itself in the estimation of all that is pious and noble.

With this sad internal was joined a no less fatal *external* condition of many. *Civil calamities and misfortunes* were the preachers of repentance that God sent in advance of the proclamation of the gospel to purify, by storms and hurricanes, the atmosphere of the heathen world, so that the sun of righteousness might the more gloriously illumine it with the rays of celestial light. Were the miseries still concealed by the robe of luxury, in the metropolis of the world-empire, in the conquered provinces the wretchedness knew no bounds. The most rigorous despotism swayed everywhere its iron sceptre. The insolence of the plundering soldiers, who enriched themselves at the expense of the conquered, rapidly increased. Had one State after another seen all its glory succumb to the eagles of Rome, whole nations stood mournfully still by the ruins of their earlier greatness. A mere æsthetic, or purely

political form of religion, could not satisfy the suffering heart, where it pined away from inward dissension with the world and itself. To the fortunate their mythology might be adapted; to the unfortunate it had little that was attractive. The conquered saw their gods received by the conquering Romans among the objects of their adoration, and thereby withdrawn forever from their own national regard. The slaves of Rome looked for freedom, the citizens of the annihilated kingdoms for an imperishable dominion, and louder than ever did the heart ask from heaven a peace that earth could never give.

Where was the remedy for all these maladies? Religion could no longer offer it, she, who had been the fruitful mother of unbelief, superstition, and immorality. But even philosophy sat down perplexed. The human understanding had run through the circle in which, left to itself, it could move. Most of the schools that had proceeded from the Socratic, still found numerous adherents. But among all we are continually struck by the same fundamental tone, the feeling of dissatisfaction, of uncertainty, of hopelessness of ever coming to a fixed knowledge of the truth. Once departed from the popular religion, men but too quickly bid farewell to all religion. How many will in their heart have subscribed the word of Pythagoras: "Whether there are gods, is a question which I will as little answer in the affirmative as in the negative." Did the *Stoic* still allow mythology to retain apparently its right because he saw in its gods only emblems of the elementary forces of nature, on the other hand he destroyed by his pride all inward religious life, and became inhuman, because he would be superhuman.* The *Cyrenaic* school assumed, for the most part, a hostile attitude towards the existing religious belief. The *Epicurean* might not entirely abnegate the existence of the gods, it denied, however, all immediate relation between the higher and the material world, and though we will not judge of its worth by the morals of its later adhe-

* M. M. Von Baumbauer, *Diss. Litt. Stoicorum περί τῆς εὐλόγου εξαγωγῆς doctrinam exponens*, Traj. 1843. p. 58.

rents, its fundamental principles constrain us to subscribe to the opinion of Cicero,* "that Epicurus, in order to give no offence to the Athenians, left them the name of the gods, but deprived them of the gods themselves." The *middle* and *new Academy* preached boldly a wretched scepticism in the domain of thelogy, and esteemed probability the highest step to which human knowledge could ascend. And when we hear, even the father of Roman eloquence, not only pronounce the existence of the gods, problematical, but also hear him reckon† a future reward and punishment simply among the *probabilia*—then we have here less a personal opinion, than a conviction shared by many, which found in him its celebrated exponent.

One means remained to philosophy for propping up the sinking religion. It consisted in giving to mythology a deeper sense, and endeavoring to remove the offensiveness of its representations, by exhibiting them as allegories of profound and true ideas. It was above all the *new Platonic school*, that adopted this course, and endeavored to commend the myths as treasuries of a higher wisdom. But heathenism was no longer adapted to such an ideal conception, as it had already sunk to so remarkable a depth, and the multitude were here too ignorant, and elsewhere too indolent, to raise themselves to such a standpoint. Soon they were obliged to acknowledge to themselves, that they were in this way viewing the ancestral doctrines and solemnities in a light in which they were, originally, by no means intended, and even where this view obtained, the illumination and reformation of mankind were still but little advanced. Such a religious feeling, as with the Greeks, resolved itself almost wholly into appreciation of the arts, with the Romans into patriotism, could not possibly become the principle of a resuscitated and improved inward life. As just that was lacking in heathenism, which is the first thing to impart light and strength to every human heart, the positive assurance, founded on facts, of God's forgiving love, so

* De Nat. Deor. I, c. 39 et. 44.

† De Nat. Deorum in fine, De Invent. I. cap. 29.

it lacked also humanity in the sublimest sense of the word. It is not surprising, that a feeling of disconsolateness and helplessness was everywhere manifested. A Cato and Cæsar dared publicly confess, that the belief in an eternal existence was fabulous, and that on yonder side of the grave neither sorrow nor joy was to be expected.* According to the testimony of Philo, there was in his time a very considerable number of atheists and pantheists.† And who is not affected at hearing such a man as the elder Pliny, in his *Natural History*, make the undisguised declaration, "that all inquiry after a higher truth may be denominated ridiculous, and that it is to be doubted, which is more advantageous to mankind, the scepticism of some, or the disgraceful religion of others, yea, that this alone is certain, that absolutely nothing certain exists,‡ and that a more wretched, as well as prouder creature than man, does not exist." Little did the learned investigator of the book of nature and of history suspect, that when he wrote this, the light had already risen in the darkness!

Was the necessity of a higher revelation realized, and desires after it awakened, we must, however, by no means imagine that the heathen world stood on an eminence, that would render the reception of Christianity *easy*. Even if history did not teach the contrary, it might be readily inferred from the nature of the case, that also here collision and conflict were unavoidable. The people remained superstitiously cleaving to ancient usages and solemnities. As a competent critic rightly observes: "The very existence of heathenism was the ground of its continuance; what has already existed, and been in force for thousands of years, continues still for a long time, even when the ideas and necessities, out of which it arose, do not as formerly exist. Many are governed by an immemorial authority: the very antiquity of the existing worship passed for a ground of faith against the youthful Christianity. Two centuries lie therefore between the period

* Sallustius, *Bell. Catalin.* Cap. 51 et 52.

† Philo, Ed. Pfeiffer, I. p. 263.

‡ Plinius, *Hist. Nat.* I. c. 7.

of the Antonines, in which the conflict was commenced, and the days of Theodosius, in which the victory was achieved."* Moreover the hierarchy did not forego its rights and claims. Religion was by countless strands most intimately united to the social and civil life. It found above all a powerful support in the so-called mysteries, which disappointed indeed the initiated, but yet continued to allure the ignorant by the promise of profounder knowledge of the truth. And still much more than the material power must the inward tendency of heathenism come in conflict with Christianity. There a purely sensual, here a purely spiritual worship. There, offerings and rites, here, abolition of all vain pomp. There, profound contempt of all Jewish superstition,† here, the doctrine: "Salvation is of the Jews." There, unbridled gratification of the lusts of the flesh, here, the requirement to crucify the flesh with its lusts. There, the school of philosophy the only way to the inmost sanctuary of truth, here, above that sanctuary the device written: "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God!" There, an insurmountable wall of partition between Greeks and Barbarians, here, the principle: "One is your master, and ye are all brethren!" There, religion stamped by nationality, here, the watchword: "Our citizenship is in heaven." There, pride its attendant, here, humility its fairest ornament. There, a wide chasm between priests and laymen, here, all called to be priests of the Lord. There, earthly good the highest aim, here, eternal joy the most brilliant crown. It was indeed to be expected, that Christianity, appearing in such a circle, would have to maintain a severe conflict. And when we consider, among what people the Redeemer of the world appeared, how weak was the strength of his first witnesses, and how spiritual were the weapons wherewith they must assail unbelief and superstition, we are not surprised that the Light of the world was greeted with gladness by many that had sat in the shadow of death, but obstinately rejected by still more from love to the darkness.

* Tzschirner, a. a. O. S. 119.

† Gieseler, a. a. O. I. S. 53.

Great was the number of the thirsty who longed for the water of life, but numerous also the host of them who girded themselves for the most sanguinary combat. Also in Greece and Rome should Christ be for the rising of many, but also for the fall of very many. Jesus was born in a time in which Augustus on the throne of the Roman Empire exhibits* to us mankind under the influence of sensuality and pride. Jesus dies in the same year that Tiberius, freed from the fear of Sejanus, abandons himself to the greatest licentiousness and tyranny, and, in the fullest sense of the word, fears nothing more. Is not the first a striking emblem of the most urgent need of, the second a very significant presage of obstinate resistance to the founder of the kingdom of God in the midst of the heathen world?

If we turn our eyes to the Jewish nation, then the difference is great. Instead of the deification of nature we find the faithful worship of the only True, who had revealed himself through Moses and the prophets. The knowledge of Him is here the property, not of select priestly castes, but of the whole nation; his law is eternally held in honor; his temple is cleansed from the abomination of false gods. Here also are exhibited important phenomena, that elicit from us the declaration: "It was the fullness of the time."

Of the *civil* liberty of the Jews, there was in the days in which Christ was born, scarcely the shadow remaining. Degraded to a conquered province of the Romans, harassed by the arbitrary conduct of Herod, torn by internal dissension, the land of Judea was a scene of political wretchedness. Already, in connection with his ascending the throne, had Herod given proofs of cruelty and cunning. Concerned above all to

* See Dr. W. G. Brill, *Golgotha en het Kapitoel*, in *de Gids*, 1845, IV. It speaks for itself, that what is said above, does no injustice to the opposite side of the matter, the susceptibility of the heathen world to Christianity, upon the relative degree of development which they had thus far under the influence of God's preparatory grace attained. On the *Ahnungen* of Christian truth in many a heathen representation, compare what we wrote, *Christol* III, bl. 96-101, and the writers cited there, also Lubker, *Propyläen zu einer Theol. des Klass. Alterth.* in the *Stud. und Krit.*, 1861, III.

retain the favor of the Romans, he neglected every means to secure the love of his people, and had as little regard for their customs as for their religion. Ambitious and weak, revengeful and suspicious, proud and irresolute, he gave the nation as little reason to be contented with the present, as to cherish hope for the future. It is not surprising that the seed of insurrection, scattered by presumptuous hands, should shoot up luxuriantly on Palestine's uncultivated field. Judas, the Galilean, a teacher of the Jews, of so great influence that Josephus traces to him all the insurrections of later years, yea, even the destruction of Jerusalem, arose and plucked with his adherents Rome's eagle from the great gate of the temple. Sadoc, an adherent of the Pharisaic party, stood at the head of another mutinous sect. And however rigorously vengeance pursued the imprudent, constantly were they or others secretly prepared for another assault.

After Herod's death the kingdom was divided among his sons. Archelaus obtained Judea and Samaria, but after the breaking out of a new insurrection he was banished by the Romans, and his domain was governed as a province of the world-empire by their proconsuls, of whom Pontius Pilate was the fifth. Herod Antipas became tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, and though he may be called a less cruel tyrant than his father, his conduct towards John the Baptist and the suffering Jesus, soon showed that he did not disown the blood, from which he had sprung. Philip, the third son, received for his inheritance the Northern parts of the country beyond the Jordan, Iturea, and Trachonitis, and reigned till in the twentieth year of Tiberius. His subjects were certainly the least to be pitied, for he lived in peace with his brothers, and discharged the duties of his administration faithfully, however immoral otherwise in disposition, till he died childless and left his sceptre to Rome, that annexed his dominion to Syria. Thus was Palestine's political heaven overspread with clouds. The lofty courage of the Maccabean heroic age had long since departed. On the one hand was creeping baseness that bowed profoundly to Rome; on the other impotent rage that set it

self constantly against Rome. Both exhibited their fatal operation, but inward and deep lived in the heart of the better disposed the desire for a Prince of David's house, who should redeem Israel "out of the hand of all his enemies."

Not less sad was the *moral* condition of the people. Did they steadfastly refuse, to their honor be it said, to follow the heathen mode of life, they could not however possibly withdraw themselves from its infectious influence. Sin had shortly before the Jewish state, according to Josephus, reached so terrible a height, that if the Romans had hesitated to conquer the land, an earthquake would perhaps have swallowed them up, a flood have drowned them, or fire from heaven have consumed them. "For," says he, "neither did any other city ever suffer such miseries, nor did any age ever breed a generation more fruitful in wickedness than this was from the beginning of the world." There were indeed better disposed persons, especially among the lower classes. The success of the Baptist serves as proof that in the breast of many the spark of something higher still glimmered, that could be fanned to a mighty flame. Also with the more respectable—a Simeon, Zacharias and others are examples—respect for God and his holy law had not yet departed. But such were only exceptions to a general rule. The national pride of descent and privileges rose continually higher. Thence proceeded the melancholy grudge against all who did not belong to the unadulterated seed of Abraham; thence the wretched conceit that it was sufficient to be a hearer of the law; thence the blind zeal for the letter of the law, which so lamentably misapprehended its spirit. Commerce, which was carried on more vigorously than before, brought the Israelite into closer contact with other nations, but became the fruitful mother of cupidity, usury, and dishonesty. And the language of Paul to the Jew, who thought he could be justified by works,* sketches for us in broad strokes an image of Israel's moral condition, that makes us involuntarily shudder, and not only

* Rom. xi. 17-29.

lets us see how deeply the malady had penetrated, which needed a deliverer from heaven, but also gives us the key to the seeming enigma: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not."

When we come to the contemplation of Israel's *religious* condition, the first thing that strikes us is the great *difference* between its then condition and that of former times. Mute was the voice of the prophets; vanished, the characteristics of the earlier theocracy; broken, the bond that century after century had united church and state. Their public worship was like a corpse from which the animating breath had just escaped, externally exhibiting still the old features, internally already assailed by a corroding decay. David's harp hung unstrung on the willows, and they who still raised themselves heavenward on the wings of sacred poetry, could only echo those transporting tones.* Did the Priests and Levites at an earlier period live on the revenues of the sanctuary alone; now they both possess considerable privileges and landed estates. Was once the law exclusive rule of faith and practice; now God's command was made of no effect by human institutions. The number of rites, festivals and sacred usages was thereby greatly increased. But if even the law could not give life, how much less tradition?

The religious condition of the Jews had, beyond doubt, its *favorable* side. We direct attention here, first of all, to the existence of the synagogues which, introduced into Israel after the Babylonian captivity as places of prayer, were seminaries of religious knowledge, and in the time of Jesus were not only found in Jerusalem, to the number of more than four hundred, but also in small cities. We further recall to mind here, the schools of the rabbis, or scribes, specifically those of Hillel and Schammai, two celebrated masters, who lived and worked a few years before Jesus' appearance. The little that is known of them with certainty, gives sufficient ground to regard them as men full of strict moral earnestness. The

* Luke i. 46-55. † Jost, *Gesch. d. Isr.* III. bl. 53.

first, above all, seems to have exercised a beneficial influence; and rabbinism was certainly, though it degenerated but too often into lifeless learning, a beneficent bulwark against the tendency of heathenism to sensuality of life. Yea, why should we hesitate to mention also, among the favorable signs of those times, the desire to convert heathens to Judaism, and to make that transition easy for them? Did the scribes often compass land and sea to gain a new son for Abraham, and did they not always make use of fair means, the aim was, and remained, laudable. Such a striving has ever been an evidence of religious interest, and could later prepare the way for the speedy extension of Christianity beyond the limits of Palestine. Finally, we should not overlook the fact, that the religious ideas had in this period received manifold *extension* and *development*. The hope of immortality, of which we meet with but comparatively few traces in Moses and the prophets, was, also under the influence of foreign ideas, constantly more generally spread. With the penetrating of the Greek language, Greek philosophy also became known to the Jews. Was the door here opened to the most arbitrary allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures; on the other hand the way was thus paved to penetrate from the letter to the spirit of the law, the people became capable of receiving new ideas, and Judaism lost something of its inflexible and rigidly defined forms.

But it is not to be denied that all this light possessed a melancholy *shady* side. Rabbinism led to literary caviling, and, in connection with learning, the spiritual life declined; Proselytism led to the blending of Jewish and heathen customs, and the Alexandrian philosophy to departure from the original Israelitish spirit. And, in addition to this, there were other unfavorable phenomena. Is dissension in itself detrimental to the cause of religion, with each of the different sects that we see prevailing among the Jews, we meet, moreover, with the most melancholy departure from it.

Rigid *orthodoxy* found in the Pharisaic party its representa-

tives.* The *Pharisees* (a name which they, as *separated* from the world, probably bore on account of their antique piety) seem to have arisen just after the Babylonian captivity. As an influential sect, they appear first a century and a-half before Christ. Eminent for learning, influence and numbers, (they amounted, according to Josephus, to not less than six thousand in the time of Herod) they secured a powerful party among the people, and acquired great political significance. By outward manifestation of piety, they captivated the ignorant multitude, and constrained those blind to follow blind guides. At their meals they observed the most rigid laws of purification; in prayer their bearing, in fasting their countenance, in giving alms the shrill trumpets at the corners of the streets, proclaimed their shining virtue. Their forehead was adorned with frontlets, containing sacred apothegms; the hems of their garments had written upon them the language of the sacred oracles, and from their lips resounded alternately long prayers and subtle interpretations of Scripture. Their doctrine, developed under the influence of tradition, was founded on the acknowledgment of God's unlimited government of the universe, by which, however, the freedom of human acts was not taken away. At the same time they accepted the existence of a spirit-world, and held firmly an immortality, where recompense of their piety awaited them. They do not seem to have believed a proper resurrection of the body any more than a metempsychosis. Their morality was wholly eudemonistic, and but too often degenerated into dry casuistry. If their heart was truly upright, this strictness might lead them to a lively apprehension of the impossibility of justification by works, and thus prepare them for Jesus' coming. But very many of them were, by worldly-mindedness, pride and hypocrisy, unsusceptible of faith in the Lord.

* See Winer. *Realwörterb.* on this Article. De Wette. *Bibl. Dogm.* § 167, 176, 182. 187. Hofstede de Groot, *Opvoed des Menschd.* III. (1847) bl. 328 en verv. *Bijbelsch Woordenb.* III. (1859) bl. 99 en verv. Finally C. E. Van Koetsveld, *Phariseën, Sadduceën en Herodianen*, 's Hage, 1862.

Over against these stand the *Sadducees*, who may be denominated politically an *aristocratic*, religiously an *ultra-liberal* party. Is also its origin from a certain Sadoc (the righteous) wholly uncertain, its existence is satisfactorily explained from the natural counteraction which the attachment of the Pharisees to oral tradition must meet from those who were of different sentiments. Thence it was, also, that their ideas in all things assumed a hostile attitude toward those of the Pharisees. The doctrine of a Providence, if not wholly denied, was at least placed considerably in the shade, and human freedom in an excessive light. They rejected not only the existence of angels and spirits, but also wholly the future life. In their morality they worked less on the desire of reward, and insisted more on an external fulfillment of the original Mosaic precept. Of two accusations meanwhile, the first relative to their belief, and the second to their walk, the one seems to be unproved, the other exaggerated. The first, that they adhered to the Pentateuch alone, and rejected the authority of the remaining books of the Old Testament, has been inferred from this that the Lord refuted their sceptical objections to the resurrection of the dead from the writings of Moses alone.* But the Lord did not, by simply using one proof, positively deny the authority of all others on their stand-point. He may also have chosen it purposely, because a consideration from Moses' law had just been proposed to him. Josephus moreover declares expressly,† that all the canonical books of the Old Testament were *universally* held as genuine. At a later period we hear the Pharisees adduce against them passages from other writings of the Old Testament, without their denying the demonstrative force or authority of those utterances. One of their number elsewhere even appeals to a Prophetic word for the confirmation of his opinion.§ And how could they, with such views, have re-

* Tertullian, De preaeser. haeret. c. 45. and Hieronymus ad Matth. xxii. 31; later still Olshausen and Neander.

† XXII: 24.

‡ Contra Apionem l. 8.

§ Gemara Sanhedrim, fo. 90, 2. Cholim, 87. Comp. Winer, in voce.

main members of the Sanhedrim, yea, have been invested with the dignity of high-priest? Would the Pharisees never have upbraided them with that unbelief? We admit that their dogmatic system can hardly be reconciled with the acknowledgment of the authority of the whole Old Testament. But does not this difficulty remain, though we hold that they acknowledged only the Pentateuch? In them, also, are contained accounts of angelic apparitions, which render it well-nigh incomprehensible how they could deny the existence of a spirit-world. Just as little can we be reconciled to another accusation, which lays to their charge great licentiousness and immorality. The rank and wealth of many brought with them their peculiar temptations, and their meagre creed lacked the powerful motives to piety and virtue which the belief of immortality presents. Meanwhile their moral standpoint seems to have been, on the whole, no lower than that of the Pharisees, who were but too ready to suspect all of levity whose direction diverged from their moral rigorism. Josephus, at least, who belonged to the last named sect, and thus had no reason for palliating the vices of the Sadducees, expressly informs us that their morals were stricter than those of the Pharisees, and that not only where they were opposed to these, but also in their intercourse with one another. Their influence on the people was far less significant, and their number, too, was smaller, than that of their opposing party. Usually vehemently embittered against these last, they united, however, more than once with them in their combat with Jesus, their common enemy, especially in the last period of his public life. The Lord had certainly no less opposition to expect from them than from the advocates of rabbinical learning.

Much less is known to us of a third sect, the Essenes, whom we may regard as representatives of a dark *mystical* persuasion. As we never see them come forward in the period of Jesus' public life, only a single word respecting them. Having

* A. J. XXII. 9, 1. B. J. II. 8, 14.

arisen,* as it seems, simultaneously with the Pharisees and Sadducees, they escaped from social life and formed a kind of religious order, whose tendency was rigidly ascetic. They are the monks of the Old Testament. Maintaining themselves on the borders of the Dead Sea by agriculture and the raising of cattle, they applied themselves especially to the study of the healing art. Community of goods prevailed among them, riches were hated, poverty was regarded as meritorious, and even celibacy was advocated by some. In only one case was the oath allowed, at the initiation into their society, into which they were admitted only after a novitiate of three years. Theosophy, in which they were absorbed, lost itself but too often in vain dreams, and the higher holiness of which they boasted, was often the mother of the most melancholy pride. In what manner they treated the Lord, cannot be determined with certainty, owing to the want of historical reports. On their rigoristic stand-point they felt themselves perhaps more attracted to the Baptist, than to his exalted successor.

The sect of the *Herodians* was a party of purely political nature. It consisted probably of Jews, who, attached to Herod Antipas, held externally with the Romans. They certainly were for that reason hated by the people and the Pharisees. Do we find them entered once and again into alliance with these last against Jesus, this phenomenon is explained by the observation, that hostile powers often extend each other the hand where it concerns the assailing of an enemy equally dangerous to both. Thus the morning of the day on which Jesus died, saw the covenant of friendship renewed between Pilate and Herod.†

* Josephus, A. J. XIII. 5. 9. On the agreement and the difference between the Essenes and Pythagoras and the Therapeutae, compare Jost, II. bl. 364-374. It is not the place here to compare the different reports of Pliny, Philo, and Josephus, relative to the Essenes with each other and bring them into agreement. They are communicated in De Wette, *Archæologie*, S. 393, etc. We agree with those who assign to Josephus the first voice in the decision of the difficult question as to the nature and spirit of this sect. The *Syntagma trium script. de trib. Jud. sectis*, ed. J. Trigland, 1703, still remains the principal source.

† Matth. xxii. 16. Mark iii. 6.; xii. 13.

Do we after all this direct our eyes to the *people*, we see them under the influence of these different parties a prey to the deepest decline. Essenism deprived the nation often of its most useful and laborious citizens (according to Josephus there were more than four thousand Essenes) and called them to a life of contracted, fanatical musing. The Sadducees could not neglect to make, by word and example, a breach upon purity of faith and seriousness of life. The Pharisees above all oppressed the ignorant multitude as with an iron sceptre, and had sentence of excommunication and anathema ready for such as durst choose for themselves a way, not pointed out by their finger. Those blind ones misled by blind guides, strayed on the brink of the abyss, and lacked even the courage to seasonably return.

One other particular we may not pass by, as an unfavorable sign of the time, the animosity that continued to prevail between *Samaritans* and *Jews*. The former, probably sprung from the union of those who remained in their own land, when Israel was carried captive to Babylon, with the heathen colonists that came to inhabit the deserted country, exhibited a wonderful mixture of Jewish and heathenish customs. They bowed down indeed like Israel before Jehovah, respected the laws of Moses, and looked for a Messiah descended from Joseph. Their dwelling-place moreover in the fertile mountainous districts between Judea and Galilee, afforded opportunity for affable intercourse with the Jews. Overpowered like these by Rome, they shared in the hatred of Abraham's posterity for that mighty foe. But much greater was the aversion which they manifested towards each other, and wide was the chasm that separated them.

No Jew had extended to a Samaritan food, drink, or hospitality. The most heinous accusations, even those of idolatry, were made by the one party against the other. They even avoided the visiting of each other's country. That aversion testified, not only of lack of religious feeling, but at the same time oppressed the material and moral strength of the Israelitish state. The ruins of the desolated temple on Gerizim's

mountain top was the faithful image of the Mosaism of those days. They still contended about forms—but life had departed.

But we must yet direct attention to the *fundamental idea*, by which the religious faith of those times was distinguished, *the expectation of the Messiah's kingdom*, was now more than ever excited. We everywhere meet in the days in which the Lord appeared, the outlook to the coming of the Redeemer. Or can it be true, what has in our age not only been said, but the proof of which has also been attempted,* that with the Jews of this period, absolutely *no* Messianic expectation prevailed, and that the abstract idea of a *Messiah* arose in the brain of Jesus alone, whilst his adherents found it realized in him, and further enveloped it with historical forms. But such an opinion is so arbitrary and most highly absurd, that we deem it unnecessary to repeat what has already been advanced by others for its refutation.† Sufficient that its advocate with all his proofs has at most only made manifest, what no one doubted, that no universally accepted Christology existed in this period, or in other words, that no perfectly rounded image of the future Messiah with the same features presented itself to the imagination of all. Shall we, however, on that account deny the existence of a general, though it were in some respects an indefinite, expectation of a Messiah? Let then all those prophetic utterances be explained to us, which a sound exegesis sees itself forced to acknowledge as Messianic. Let it also be explained to us, why Josephus so distinctly alludes to those expectations.‡ Let it be explained, how later Jewish scholars came at the idea of a Messiah, if it were only a chimerical invention of the Christians who were inimical to them. Let it be explained why, according to the express declaration of Josephus,§ the Jews of that time on the

* B. Baner, Synoptiker, I. S. 391–416.

† Ebrard, a. a. O. S. 651–669.

‡ Especially the manner in which he avoids the Messianic declaration of Dan. II: 34, by saying: "But I do not think it proper to relate it; since I have only undertaken to describe things past or things present; but not the things that are future." A. J. X. 10. 4.

§ De Bell. Ind. VI. 5, 4.

ground of their sacred writings cherished the hope, that God would raise up out of the midst of them a Deliverer and World-ruler, which prediction that historian, from a desire to flatter, deemed fulfilled in Vespasian. That the acquaintance with these expectations among heathen nations, which is made sure by profane writers, is on this stand-point one of the greatest enigmas, needs hardly be intimated. Enough already respecting an opinion, that tears the new dispensation entirely loose from the old, that can be maintained only by the most arrogant arbitrariness, and that would not perhaps have deserved mention, had it not at the same time established our right to the question: What was the *nature* of the Messianic expectation which we see prevailing in this period among the Jews?

The answer to this question is far from easy. They who have taken the pains to examine the ideas of the Jews touching a future Deliverer, have not always properly distinguished between the representations of Jesus' contemporaries, and those of later scholars.* The New Testament gives but few hints respecting the opinions which prevailed relative to this subject, and in regard to these it often remains a question, whether the representations there met with, were merely individual or generally prevalent. What can here be established with any degree of certainty, amounts to the following: The Jews divided the entire history of the world into two principal periods, the present and the future. At the end of the first the coming of the Messiah has place, whose way, it was expected, would be prepared, and his coming announced by Elijah the Prophet, who was to appear a second time. The Jews expected Him from the tribe of Judah and the family of David, (the Samaritans on the contrary from Ephraim) and regarded Bethlehem as the place of his approaching birth. Of

* This applies particularly to Berthold's well-known *Christologia Judæorum*, and to Glöckner's *Jahrh. d. Heils*. But also after what has been more recently attempted, it cannot yet be asserted, that a clear and full light has been shed upon it. Compare what we wrote respecting it, *Christologie*, I, (1855) pp. 508-522.

an extraordinary birth by the Holy Ghost they seem not to have thought. Anointed with the Spirit of God, and richly furnished with higher powers, he should not only make an end to all religious disputes, and effect a restoration of religion and morals which had so sadly declined, but above all should shine forth in royal dignity. He should deliver Israel from the oppressive yoke of his enemies, yea, he should conquer all the earth for the sake of the chosen people, in order so to found a universal theocratic government. Then should a golden age of peace and happiness dawn, and Jerusalem's temple be the centre of a dominion, of which Israel should enjoy the glory and all the world the blessing. Moral improvement was, especially according to the better disposed, the condition of his manifestation. Hence it was that John's requirement of repentance excited as little surprise as it met with contradiction, and that still at the present day the Jews ascribe the delay of the Messianic period to their transgressions. That He should make reconciliation for the sins of the people, seems also to have belonged to the expectation of those days, at least among the most pious portion of the nation; but how they represented to themselves the mode of that reconciliation, is in the highest degree uncertain. Later Jews thought of a reconciliation by improvement of the people, by his intercession, or by seclusion after his birth.* Of reconciliation by a vicarious death, we find among Jesus' contemporaries but very few traces. It seems rather to have been the expectation of the multitude, that the Christ should remain forever, and reign for ages.†

The representation of the Messiah's person, that prevailed with most, was that he should be a true man, anointed to be a theocratic king, filled with the Holy Spirit, and invested with the most unlimited authority.‡ This representation was

* See De Wette, *Bibl. Dogm.* § 202, and the writers there cited.

† John i. 29. Comp. Luke ii. 34.

‡ Therefore said the Jew Tryphon in Justin Martyr in his *Dial.* c. Tryph. cap. 49: πάντες ἐμὲς ἢ τὸν χριστὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκᾶμεν γενέσθαι. The question: "Is not this the carpenter's son?" expresses indeed surprise at Jesus' lowly condition, but not that he had a human father.

wholly in accordance with the spirit of Hebraism, which so emphatically placed on the foreground the absolute unity of Jehovah, and distinguished him so sharply from the world, that the idea of a man, at the same time a partaker in truth of the divine nature, could here with difficulty find place. Some, however, expected that the king of the kingdom of God should unexpectedly appear, and in a mysterious manner, and that it should not be known whence he was. The Logos-conception we nowhere find among Jesus' contemporaries specifically brought into relation with the Messianic idea. The name of *Son of God* was usually given to the Messiah, not to express a supernatural, but the theocratic elevation of his person, as already under the Old Testament, that appellation was, in a weaker sense, given to men who were supports of the theocracy. The fundamental idea of Christianity that God in Christ has entered into personal relation with mankind, is no fruit of Jewish soil; it had entered into no human heart till it was revealed as *fact*.* That some of Jesus' contemporaries on ground of Dan. vii. 13, 14, represented† to themselves the Messiah as a supernatural and divine being, we deem incapable of proof. It was indeed generally expected of the Deliverer, that he would perform miracles, raise the dead at the last day, and hold the last judgment.

In the treatment of the evangelical history itself, we shall be able to discover the traces of all we have said. This can be uttered here as general truth, that the Messianic expectation in Jesus' time was different with different ones; that it was developed less by the light of the Old Testament, than modified by the circumstances and calamities of the times, and in the period of which we speak lived more than ever on the tongues of all, and in the hearts of all. We have also seen that each expected just that from the Messiah, which he deemed the most desirable, in order to heal the breach of Zion. The

* Dörner, a. a. O. I. S. 63.

† As is asserted by Strauss, *Dogmatik* II. S. 81; and De Wette. *Bibl. Dogm.* S. 171. The proof which the last mentioned supposes, he finds in the book of Enoch for the faith of Jesus' contemporaries, in a divine nature of the Messiah, appears to us in the highest degree dubious.

earthly-minded multitude panted for freedom, national glory, and sensual bliss: the better disposed hoped also, that He would teach them to serve God without fear, that He would also be a light to lighten the Gentiles, and would dispense spiritual gifts. The former, therefore, lent a ready ear to every seducer who dared pretend to be the Messiah, and who uttered the magic words: Liberty and Victory. The latter went bowed down under the deep declension of the times, and wished what Simeon prayed, that they might not taste death till they had seen the Lord's Christ. We meet, however, with none, with whom the expectation of higher blessing to be bestowed by the Messiah, was wholly free from earthly-minded prospects, and even to the wings of the hope that raised itself most purely towards heaven, cleaved the dust of this world.

And yet, how high stands the Jewish nation, even in its deepest decline, above the heathen world! Heathenism lies on its death-bed, and all the sages whose eyes were opened to discern the spirit of their age, expected soon to hear its knell. Mosaism too is antiquated, and they who took profounder views perceived that the existing form of religion no longer met the necessity of the present. But where the reflecting heathen sat down disconsolate on the ruins of the past, without hope for the future, the pious Jew stands with believing desire gazing at the signs of the times, and has an obscure but profound conviction that the present dissolution contains already the germ of a fairer restoration. The question: Watchman, what of the night? is at Rome the question of dull despondency, but in Palestine the expression of believing and panting desire. And while elsewhere the mists of ignorance, sin and misery, which have settled densely over the earth, are viewed as harbingers of an eternal night, for Israel, in the midst of that terrible darkness, the star of hope stands bright and high in the heaven.

We must yet direct attention to *the reciprocal relation of the Jewish and Gentile world* of those days, in order here also to clearly perceive the fullness of the time.

The separation between the two was incipiently removed. Had earlier high walls stood not only between Jews and Gentiles, but also between the Gentile nations themselves, each of which had its own religion, customs and notions, they were now incipiently leveled. As different streams empty into the same wide ocean, so the smaller states were now resolved into the great world-empire. It is known how widely extended this empire had become. It comprised at the time of Christ's appearance, Western Asia, Northern Africa, Southern and Western Europe. On all sides relations were formed and ways opened, not existing before. A universal peace reigned among the nations that bowed to the sceptre of Augustus. The temple of Janus was closed. In such a period the Prince of peace could appear, and one of his principal ambassadors, as Roman citizen, spread the gospel everywhere unhindered. The unity of *language* served no less to draw the cords more closely. The Greek had become the language of the whole civilized world, and, as Cicero somewhere assures us,* Greek books were read among almost all nations, whilst the Latin remained confined within narrower limits. Even among the Jews that language had penetrated, and though the Hebrew was and remained the language of the people, so that they listened with the greater attention to Paul at Jerusalem, because he used the language of the country, the knowledge of the Greek was sufficiently general among them. This means also was eminently adapted to promote the founding of the kingdom of God. Into this language the sacred books of the Old Testament had already been translated, and thus become accessible to thousands. The history of the ancient chosen people was known to Greeks and Romans, and with it not only the pure doctrine of religion, proclaimed by Moses, but also the Messianic expectation, preserved by his followers as a treasure. And the more faith in the heathen religion was undermined, the less they found in philosophy the peace they so eagerly sought, the more attentively did men listen to the

* Cicero, *Pro Archia*, cap. X.

word of consolation and hope that was here proclaimed. The Jews themselves were spread everywhere. Thousands of them dwelt in Babylonia alone, in Egypt still more.* Those scattered Jews (*διασπορά*) were as a fruitful germ cast upon the Gentile field. Not in vain had Alexander the Great transported a multitude of Abraham's sons to Alexander. Not in vain had his successor Ptolemy established more than a hundred thousand Israelites in his kingdom and granted them his high patronage. The temporal prosperity with which they were favored in foreign lands, they rewarded tenfold by helping to spread the light of the most beneficent knowledge. From their synagogues, from their temple at Leontopolis, went forth those rays of light which not a few received with eager eyes. If some Romans accepted the Jewish religion, others showed for the institutions of that nation high respect, and it is known that the emperor Augustus had a daily offering for his welfare made to the Deity that was worshiped at Jerusalem, and thus showed that he cherished respect for this foreign Religion. Even at Rome it belonged to those religions whose public worship was allowed and protected by the state (*collegia licita*). And the complaints of Seneca, Juvenal, and others respecting the prevailing superstitious religion of the Jews, are a striking testimony to their many-sided influence, and confirm what Philo has somewhere testified that the Jews were destined to become prophets and priests of all mankind. The proselytes of *the gate*, especially (who bound themselves less strictly to all the forms of Judaism than the proselytes of *righteousness*, who submitted to circumcision and all the prescriptions of the law) were eminently adapted to accept believably the light of the gospel, even more than some Jews, who supposed that they already possessed the truth, which these still everywhere sought.

* Josephus, A. J. X. V. 3. 1., speaks of οὐκ ὀλίγοι μυριάδες in Babylonia. Compare Strabo, XIV. 12. Philo, *Legat. ad Cuj.* p. 1051, and especially the well-known declaration of Seneca, *De superstition*, in Augustine *De Civ. Dei.* VI, 11: "eo sceleratissimae gentis consuetudo invaluit, ut per omnes terras recepta sit; victi victoribus leges dederunt."

If we take all these circumstances together, it is manifest with how much right we exalt the wisdom of God in the choice of the time in which Christ appeared. We see all circumstances concur to make mankind ripe and fitted for his advent. Yea, so greatly is He centre and key of the history of the world, that we are not surprised at the declaration of the celebrated historian, Johannes von Müller: "I saw the greatest result brought about by the most insignificant means; I saw the relation of all the nations of Asia and Europe to that despised Israel; I saw religion appear just at the most fitting moment for its establishment. All events work together for the establishment and extension of this doctrine. Since I have learned to know our Lord, all has become clear to me. The light that blinded Paul on his way to Damascus, was not more marvelous to him than what I suddenly saw: the fulfillment of all expectations, the point of perfection of all philosophy, the explanation of all revolutions, the key to all seeming contradictions in the material and moral world: life and immortality."

ART. III.—RAPHAEL SANZIO.

By Rev. A. D. GRIDLEY, D. D., Clinton, N. Y.

1. *Lives of the most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, translated from the Italian of *GIORGIO VASARI*, with notes and illustrations chiefly selected from various commentators. By Mrs. Jonathan Foster. London: Henry G. Bohn, York st., Covent Garden. In five vols. 1850.

2. *Memoirs of the Early Italian Painters*. By MRS. JAMESON, author of "Characteristics of Women," &c. From the tenth English edition. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1859.

On sitting down to study the life and analyze the character of a distinguished genius, we confess to some degree of hesitation, lest we should thereby become disenchanted. Mont Blanc is better seen from the distant plain than from its own

rocky sides. In looking at a great picture, if we hold our eyes close to the canvass, we may get all its petty details, but we must stand further off if we would take in its grand outlines and catch its true meaning and purpose. Thus we may get so near a great mind that, while we learn the facts and dates that go to make up its history, we may yet lose sight of the real man and fail to catch his informing spirit.

Yet, on the other hand, it is a rational curiosity which seeks to learn all that it is proper and possible to know of the experience and life-work of the eminent dead. Taught from childhood to speak their names with admiring reverence, we would fain know *why* they are to be revered. Hearing their great deeds recited, we would learn how they came to accomplish so much, and wherein their strength lay. Was their greatness real, or only factitious? What are the legacies which they have bequeathed to posterity, and what the lessons which they teach? It is in such a spirit, and with such motives, that we would now survey the life and works of Raphael Sanzio, the greatest of painters.

The events of his life were few and simple. He was born the 28th of March, 1483, in the city of Urbino, Italy. His father, Giovanni Sanzio, was himself a respectable painter and poet, a man of cultivated mind and polished manners, and well fitted to foster and direct the genius of his only son. It is recorded to his credit that he would not allow his infant boy to be put out to a hired nurse, as was the general custom, but insisted that his own mother should nurse him. The cabin of a rude peasant he thought was not the safest place for the child's health, nor the best for his morals and manners. Alas! the mother who bore him died when he was only eight years old. It is believed that he remembered her with much tenderness, and in his Holy Families, painted in after life, sought to express his fond conception of the tie between a mother and her child. The genius of Raphael displayed itself quite early. Indeed, it is said that he assisted his father in his studio before he was eleven years of age. But Giovanni was not satisfied with being himself the only

teacher of his son ; he wished to give him the best training which could be procured. Where should he look for a competent instructor ?

The leading masters of that day were Leonardi da Vinci at Milan, Correggio at Parma, Titian at Venice, Francesco Francia at Bologna, and Pietro Perugino at Perugia. Leonardo and Pietro were his favorites, but between these his choice long hesitated. What would have been the influence of the first upon his young and impressible scholar ? He was, perhaps, the greatest painter of the age. Breaking through the rigid rules and formal technicalities which had bound artists before him in dull routine, and which still held most of his cotemporaries, he returned to nature, and by a careful study of her laws advanced his art to a much higher point than he found it. His fresco of *The Last Supper*, the most widely known of his works, remains an evidence of his superior genius. But with all his endowments and attainments, he lacked mental balance and power of concentrated effort. He was fond of natural history, and devoted much attention to architecture and engineering, to music, poetry, and antiquities : in short, there was no subject of speculation to which he did not give more or less time and thought. Jarvis says of him : " Whatever he turned his mind to he promptly mastered. His weakness lay in the variety and range of his genius. Hence a craving to prove all things ; a constant desire of experiment and new acquirements, begetting a certain instability of purpose, and frequent changes of pursuits, in any one of which he equaled or excelled his cotemporaries, without bestowing upon it the full measure of his capacity. In reality, he was embarrassed by his extraordinary mental wealth, and power of choice of greatness ; whilst his special need was that concentrated ambition, which, fired by powerful passions, inevitably leads to grand undertakings and commensurate results."* Hence he became fitful and inconstant in his artistic pursuits, frittering away valuable time and

* Art Hints, p. 383.

power in side efforts, and accomplishing much less in this field of labor than might have been expected of him. Had Raphael become the pupil and companion of such a man, he would very likely have imbibed a measure of his inconstancy of purpose, and so have become less eminent in after life. Therefore we must needs admire the good sense of his father, and the wisdom of that Providence, which chose Perugino for his teacher instead of Leonardo.

Raphael was twelve years old when taken to Perugia. The works of his new instructor had at this time acquired so high a repute as to be eagerly sought for throughout all Europe, and commanded high prices. His style is represented as "simple, ideal, graceful, tender," and inspired at times with ecstatic feeling. He founded a school known as the Umbrian, from the range of mountains on whose western slope Perugia was built. His scholars, some of whom were artists of considerable repute, thought themselves highly honored by his presence and instructions. He taught them, it is said, that it was not enough to copy the exact lineaments of nature, but to infuse that resemblance with a loftier spirit, which should speak to the soul more than to the senses. It was to this famous teacher that his father brought Raphael, and here he remained, with only a few intervals of absence, until he was twenty years of age. His time was occupied, at first, in drawing from models and from nature, and in copying the works of Perugino. Diligent in study, ardently devoted to his calling, and determined to succeed in it,—such was the record which the teacher made of his pupil year after year. Following the bent of his master, his studies ran in the direction of the religious school. His copies of Perugino's designs were so accurately done, and so thoroughly imbued with his spirit, that before he was sixteen years old they were often mistaken for originals. In his own independent efforts, his favorite subjects were the Madonna and infant Christ. Several of these and a St. Catharine have been preserved to this day, and reflect the traces of Perugino's style, with here and there an improvement on his method. During one of his

teacher's long absences from home, Raphael went to Cita di Castello, where he produced several pictures; among them one called the *Spozalizio*, representing the marriage of Joseph and Mary, which may now be seen at Milan. Not far from this period, he painted also the *Knight's Dream*, now in the British National Gallery, the *Agony in the Garden*, and the *St. Michael and St. George*. These were all executed in what is known as his first or *Peruginesque* manner, and can easily be distinguished from his later productions.

The fame of great masters in other cities now began to reach him, and he longed to see their works, especially the cartoons of Da Vinci and of Michael Angelo at Florence. To Florence, then, he bent his steps. Here he formed the acquaintance of Ghirlandajo, Fra Bartolomeo, and other artists, all of whom, except Angelo, received him graciously. A new and wide field of effort and improvement now spread before him. The family of the Medici, who possessed a fine collection of ancient marbles, threw it open to all artists, and Raphael gladly seized this opportunity to study the antique. He also examined critically the frescoes of Mazaccio, and the designs of Da Vinci and Angelo. These new studies wrought a change in his style, producing what is called his second manner. Hitherto, his compositions had somewhat resembled mere collections of separate portraits placed in juxtaposition; now they became groups of men and women inspired with a common sympathy; his figures assumed an ease of posture and a graceful flow of movement which they had not known before. But, great as was his progress at Florence, it must not be supposed that his early study and practice at Perugia were of little account: they gave him the precision and accuracy of naturalistic art, on which to build the greater freedom and grace of the classical. His residence at Florence opened his eyes to new aspects of nature and unknown possibilities of art; it furnished him better models of study and comparison, and brought him into contact with other great minds, who fired his ambition and encouraged his hope of success. He did not servilely copy the productions of his senior

artists, though he learned much from them. Indeed, he made everything tributary to his improvement, "mingling and transfusing all his acquisitions, by the alchemy of his own mind, into new styles," and so returning to the world more and better than he received.

His friendship with Fra Bartolomeo was particularly tender, and continued unbroken till death. It was of mutual benefit, at least in one particular, the good Friar explaining to Raphael many of the mysteries of coloring, while he taught him in return the laws of perspective.

During his sojourn of about four years in Florence, he made two prolonged visits to Perugia; and Perugino, far from indulging jealousy at the rising fame of his pupil, received him with great cordiality. While here he painted several pictures—Christ borne to the Sepulchre, a Madonna, and several altar-pieces for the churches of the city. About this period, he painted in Florence numerous portraits, an altar-piece for the church of San Spirito, called *La Belle Jardinière*, and now in the Louvre at Paris; his Madonna of the Palm-tree, now in the Ellesmere collection; and his Madonna of the Goldfinch, now in the Florentine gallery. Soon after these came his St. George; the Entombment, now in the Borghese gallery; and the Portrait of himself, now in a public museum of Florence, and which has been made familiar to all eyes by engravings.

Raphael was younger than most of the leading artists of his time; indeed, he had risen up under their very shadow. He rose from poverty, and without the help of influential friends to foist him into notice. Whatever reputation he possessed was the fruit of real merit. The world soon began to discover his great abilities. He had not been to Rome to proclaim himself, but Rome heard of him, and his name was spoken with honor in her high places. Pope Julius II., on the recommendation of Bramante, his chief architect, invited him to the Holy City for the purpose of embellishing with frescoes the halls of the Vatican. A high honor this for a youth of scarcely twenty-five years, while, Angelo excepted,

other masters of great repute were passed without notice. The invitation of the pontiff was so urgent that Raphael was obliged to proceed at once to Rome, leaving behind him several unfinished works, which Ghirlandajo and Fra Bartolomeo consented to complete.

It is customary to associate the golden age of art with the brief pontificate of Leo X. He was indeed a most munificent and discriminating patron of all the arts; but it is a mistake to suppose that he originated all of those grand designs which were executed during his reign, and which gave it so much lustre, or that the wonderful progress of art in the 16th century was due solely to his fostering care and liberality. His predecessor, Julius II., though a warlike monarch, and ambitious chiefly to extend the bounds of the Holy See by the sword, was yet hardly less earnest in his encouragement of art. His tastes were doubtless less refined, and his views less liberal, than those of Leo, but he knew well that something beside military pomp was needed to give dignity and grace to a court. He desired, moreover, to link his name with the productions of those works of genius which were sure of immortality. Hence he chose learned men for his cardinals, and surrounded himself with the best sculptors, painters and architects.

Among his many schemes of greatness, was one for the rebuilding of St. Peter's, and another for the enlargement and embellishment of the Vatican. And it was for the prosecution of these and kindred works, that he sought the services of Michael Angelo and Raphael. Angelo had been engaged some time previous to the coming of Raphael, in planning and building a splendid mausoleum for the pontiff; but his long delays irritated his holy master beyond endurance, and the work was finally abandoned in mutual disgust. It was at this juncture that Raphael was called to Rome. The special work assigned to him was the decoration in fresco of that part of the Vatican known as the *Camere*. Painting in fresco opened a new and higher career for the artist. His productions in oil hitherto were not without defects of design and

execution, but when he entered this field of effort his hand acquired a greater freedom and boldness, in which the lighter elegancies and graces of art were subordinated to grandeur and sublimity.

For the walls of the first saloon of the Vatican, styled the *Camera della Segnatura*, he chose for his theme the glory of intellectual pursuits, and embodied it in allegorical representations of Theology, Poetry, Philosophy and Jurisprudence. In working out his design, he first painted four small circular pictures on the ceiling, which are allegorical, and designed simply as an index to the main pictures on the walls below. By the side of the figure symbolizing Theology is a representation of the Fall; next to Poetry is the Punishment of Marsyas; by the side of Philosophy is a female figure examining a globe; and near to Jurisprudence is a view of the Judgment of Solomon. Underneath these, on the four walls of the apartment, are the principal subjects. The scenes are historical. *Theology*, sometimes styled the Dispute of the Sacrament, consists of an assemblage of church dignitaries, seated in council, and deliberating on the mysteries of religion, while above them is a heavenly glory, with Christ presiding over a vast concourse of angels, patriarchs, martyrs and saints. *Philosophy*, sometimes called the School of Athens, is a grand portico, around whose steps and doorway are grouped the philosophers and sages of antiquity. Highest in this scene, and as representing intellectual philosophy, stand Plato, Socrates and Aristotle; at a lower point, and as representing the arts and sciences, we have Pythagoras, Archimedes, Zoroaster, and Ptolemy, the geographer; and alone, by himself, sits Diogenes, the cynic. *Poetry* brings us Mt. Parnassus, with knots of ancient and modern poets, with Apollo and the Muses in the centre. Homer and Virgil, Dante and Petrarch, the fountain of Helicon, and all the rest are here. The fourth wall gives us *Jurisprudence*, where Justinian is seen giving his civil code to the doctors for their revision; and not far away is Pope Gregory IX., setting forth the Canon Law. With the Pope are associated cardinals, and other eminent ecclesiastics, living and dead.

This series of paintings, now known as the "Stanza of Raphael," was a work of great labor. Critics of every generation have placed it among the best products of human art. As one who has recently visited Rome remarks: "In these pictures, which still glow with bright and steadfast colors, the art of painting was consecrated to its noblest uses, and achieved its grandest triumphs. Nothing can be more majestic, more elevated, truer to the simplicity of nature, and more free from the tricks of artistic effect than the style of these inimitable works." When these frescoes were finished, which it had required the constant labor of two years to execute, Julius was so well pleased with them that he ordered all the other pictures in the Vatican to be effaced, and the walls prepared afresh for Raphael. A compliment like this, however gratifying to the subject of it, could not fail to bring upon him the resentment of his brother painters, who yet knew that it was not attributable to his personal ambition, but rather to the impulsive temperament of the Pope.

With only a little delay, Raphael addressed himself to the composition of a new series of frescos, the main design of which was to celebrate the triumph of the church over her enemies. This is called the Stanza of Heliodorus, from the Expulsion of Heliodorus, which is pictured on one of the walls. The second scene is the Mass at Bolsena, the third is Attila terrified by a Celestial Vision, and the fourth, St. Peter delivered from Prison. On the ceiling are representations of the Sacrifice of Isaac, Jacob's Dream, and the Burning Bush. Our limited space forbids a description of these works: only it may be said that they are fully equal to the first Stanza.

The artist's fame rose with every performance, and he was overwhelmed with solicitations from private patrons. Among the commissions which he was able to execute at this time, mention is made of the portrait of Julius II., the Triumph of Galatea, and the Sybils del Pace, the two last of which were frescoes for the palace of Agostino Chigi, a rich banker of Rome, whose munificence to artists was hardly less than that of the pontiff himself. A characteristic letter of Ra-

phael, written to a friend at this period, is worthy of record here : " With respect to the *Galatea*," he says, " I should hold myself to be a great master, if there were in it half the merits of which you write ; but in your words I cannot fail to perceive the partiality of your friendship for myself. To paint a figure truly beautiful, it might be necessary that I should see many beautiful forms, with the further provision that you should yourself be near to select the best ; but seeing that good judges and beautiful women are scarce, *I avail myself of certain ideas which come into my mind*. Whether I have in myself any portion of the excellence of art, I know not, but I labor heartily to secure it." The modest self-depreciation of this letter is not the least of its merits.

While he was prosecuting thus successfully public and private works, Michael Angelo finished his frescoes of the Sistine Chapel, and they were thrown open to the public. Some spectators came only to mock, many to admire, and among these latter Raphael, who was filled with delight, and declared himself most fortunate in being permitted to live in the same age with this great Master.

About this time, certain critics discover a growing resemblance between the manner of Raphael and of Angelo. To which it may be replied, that the seeming resemblance involved no imitation ; it was a resemblance which came from a common striving after excellence. At Rome, as at Perugia and Florence, Raphael was a close and untiring student of nature and the wide field of art, gathering up knowledge and skill from every quarter. He could not do otherwise. It was the nature of his mind to seek after excellence wherever found, and to incorporate it into the substance of his varied attainments. He also improved upon his acquisitions. So that, though his style may have been modified by other masters and schools, his individuality remained to the last. And if he gained knowledge and inspiration from others, so, and much more, did others learn from him. In Angelo's works, almost unapproachable as they are, there was yet a certain exhibition of brute force, of overstrained intensity and cold grandeur,

which few observers can wholly admire. Raphael's designs gained somewhat in energy and sublimity by the study of these compositions, but he could not adopt the same style. Instead of that, he improved upon it, and cultivated what Angelo lacked, viz., grace, beauty, refined expression, purity, superhuman dignity and sweetness.

Before the second Hall of the Vatican was completed, Pope Julius died, and was succeeded by Leo X. A pontiff of such liberal tastes could do no otherwise than carry out the unfinished plans of his predecessor, and project new ones. Gladly, too, would he have employed the services of so famous a master as Angelo, but the great Florentine was so perverse and irascible that the Pope determined to dispense with his aid. Raphael was instructed to proceed with the embellishment of the other apartments of the Vatican. The one known as the Loggie—a series of galleries surrounding an open court—he resolved to adorn with subjects taken from the Old Testament. This was not the work of a day. To qualify himself for it, he read much in ancient history, and thoroughly informed himself in the manners and customs of Eastern nations. He also sent artists into Asia Minor to make drawings of oriental scenery and costumes, and to collect whatever information would help to illustrate his subjects. In the final painting of his numerous scenes, he was aided by other artists and by his scholars.

This unbounded success brought him wealth as well as fame. He was now at the height of his greatness. He built himself a mansion in that quarter of the city, known as the Novo Borgo, and his friendship and society were courted by the leading statesmen and authors of the day. Leo treated him as a personal friend, and placed him on a footing of social equality. Young artists flocked to him from all parts of Southern Europe. As he went daily to the Vatican, to superintend his works, he was escorted by a train of fifty or more students, the admirers of his genius and imitators of his style. On a certain morning, as this brilliant retinue passed by the house of Angelo, the latter called out derisively:—"You

march with a grand train, like a general." "And you," retorted Raphael, "*go alone*, like an executioner,"—the only ungracious speech which is recorded of him. Painters of wide repute in other cities came to Rome to inspect the works of which they had heard such marvelous reports. Even Leonardo da Vinci and Fra Bartolomeo, older by many years than Raphael, were not too proud to visit him. The latter could not find words to express his admiration; and his own mind received such an impulse that on returning home he executed some of the best paintings which ever came from his hand.

On the death of Bramante, Raphael was appointed superintendent of the construction of St. Peter's. This great enterprise, however, did not prevent him from devoting the intervals of his labor to minor productions. Of his smaller pieces, dating from about this period, are his *Madonnas of the Pearl*, of the *Fish*, the *Seggiola*, and the *dell' Impannata*. Among his easel pictures are the *St. Cecilia*, the *Nativity of our Lord*, and *Christ bearing his Cross*. Several portraits also belong to this period, the most noted of which are those of *Leo the Tenth*, of *Joanna of Arragon*, *Beatrice of Ferrara*, and the *Fornarina*, supposed to be the likeness of a beautiful Roman lady to whom he was too fondly attached. His picture of *Christ Bearing his Cross*, which was painted for the monks of *Monte Oviato*, in *Palermo*, *Sicily*, had an adventure which is worthy of recital. Soon after being finished, it was dispatched to its destination by sea. But a storm drove the vessel upon the rocks, and sunk everything to the bottom except this painting which, being securely packed, floated about, and finally drifted unharmed into the *Gulf of Genoa*. The inhabitants of the coast found it, and were overjoyed on becoming so easy possessors of such a beautiful prize. In the excess of their delight they could not keep it secret; and when the news reached the ears of the monks, they came and carried the painting to *Sicily*, "where," as *Vasari* observes, "it has more reputation than *Mount Etna* itself."^{*}

After the several halls of the Vatican had been embellished with frescoes, Leo desired to decorate the lower walls of the Sistine Chapel with rich tapestries, the designs to be prepared by Raphael, and the tapestries to be woven in the looms of Flanders, in silk, and wool, and gold. This work was undertaken with the painter's usual industry, and accomplished with his usual success. That the tapestries might be of the highest possible excellence, he elaborated the drawings from which they were to be worked, with great care. The cartoons, eleven in number, and illustrating Scripture themes, were painted in distemper and sent to Arras, in Flanders, where they remained until the time of Charles the First, when, by the advice of Rubens, they were purchased for the English government. They now occupy a gallery in Hampton court palace. For executing these designs, Raphael received four hundred and thirty-four gold ducats (about \$3,000), while the manufacturer of the tapestries was paid fifty thousand ducats. They were each between fourteen and eighteen feet long, and about twelve feet high, the figures being above life-size. On being brought to Rome, the tapestries were suspended against the walls of the chapel, underneath the sublime frescoes of Angelo. The effect was grand, above expectation, and when the doors were thrown open to the art-loving Romans, they could not refrain from loud applause.

The after history of these works deserves mention in this place. During the sack of Rome by the French, in 1527, they were carried away to France, as part of the spoils of war. In the reign of Pope Julius the Third, they were restored by the Duc Montmorenci, with the exception of a single piece representing the Coronation of the Virgin. In 1798, they were again plundered by the French, but before reaching France, they were sold to a Jew in Leghorn, who finally transferred them, for a consideration, to Pius the Seventh, who restored them to their proper places.

Not far from the period now under notice, Raphael produced one of his finest works, and one that has taken strong hold of the popular heart, viz., his Sistine Madonna, painted for

the convent of St. Sixtus. Not only in first class engravings, but in cheap lithographs and woodcuts, we have all seen the Holy Mother and Child standing upon the clouds, with St. Sixtus and St. Barbara on either side, and the two cherubs below.

No man constituted like Raphael could remain insensible to female charms. Courtied, flattered, living in luxury, in the midst of a corrupt city, where celibacy was esteemed a virtue, it were not strange if his amours sometimes overstepped the bounds of propriety. Some of his biographers resent all intimations of this sort; but we do not find sufficient proof that he lived altogether above reproach. He was never married, and formed no permanent attachments among the cultivated and beautiful ladies by whom he was surrounded. The cardinal Bibienna offered him his niece in wedlock, with a handsome dowry, but as she had not been the choice of his heart, he declined betrothing himself until after long delay, and then, alas! the fair Maria died before the nuptials were celebrated. Leo had indirectly promised him a cardinal's hat, and it is surmised that his expectation of this appointment led him to postpone matrimony.

When Raphael was made superintendent of the building of St. Peter's, he anticipated greater satisfaction and higher honor as an architect, than he had gained as a painter. He did not affect to despise painting, as did Angelo, declaring that it was work suitable only for women and idlers; he wished rather to combine the two kindred arts, and to bear away the palm in both. The re-building of St. Peter's afforded him just the opportunity he desired. As we have already seen, this was one of the original projects of Julius the Second. By his order, Bramante had begun to clear away the ruins of the old Basilica, that he might build on the same site the grandest of Christian temples. On the death of Julius and of Bramante, this work was resumed by Raphael under appointment of Leo. The labor of removing the old structure and gathering materials for the new, occupied several years. At this time, little was known of the architectural and artistic treasures of an-

cient Rome which lay buried under the dust of centuries. But as Raphael proceeded with his explorations, one vestige after another of classic art was brought to light and awakened great interest in further researches. He now conceived a new and important scheme, which was nothing less than a thorough examination and measurement of the whole area occupied by the ancient city, the excavation and disinterment of buildings and valuable relics, and the drawing of plans and models by which to represent the old architecture as it appeared in the days of Augustus. This was a most congenial labor, and was pursued with zeal and that conscientious thoroughness which marked all his undertakings.

One more production of Raphael's pencil—and it was his last—remains to be mentioned, viz., the Transfiguration, designed originally for the cathedral church of Narbonne, in France. As has already appeared, Michael Angelo was jealous of the fame of his rival, and chagrined and mortified at the unfavorable comparisons sometimes made between them. As Raphael was proceeding with his work of the Transfiguration, Angelo resolved to measure his powers with him, confident of an easy victory. And here we may observe that this practice of publicly competing for artistic supremacy was nothing new. Ten years before, Leonardo and Angelo had contested for the prize of superiority in cartoons for the Town Hall at Florence, a contest which excited a wide public attention, and in which Leonardo carried off the honors. In the present case, Angelo's conduct seems to have been hardly honorable. He did not enter the lists publicly, but attempted to raise up another painter who, by *his* assistance secretly given, should outstrip and humble his great rival. Conscious of his own superiority in design, he was yet aware of his relative feebleness in coloring. And so, that there might be no hazard of failure, he plotted with one Sebastiano del Piombo—a Venetian painter of the school of Giorgione, and in high esteem for the richness and warmth of his colors—engaging him to finish the painting of which he himself should privately furnish the drawing. Now, the world shall see that an artist

of even moderate repute, can excel the boasting Raphael Sanzio! Before commencing this work, the Raising of Lazarus, he designed two other pictures, which were painted by Sebastiano, and greatly admired. But this was only skirmishing; it was merely training his faculties and those of Sebastiano to work in concert for a combined engagement with his great competitor. When the painting of Lazarus was finished and set up for exhibition by the side of the Transfiguration, he intrigued for permission to decide upon the merits of the two productions! One could hardly believe this allegation, so unworthy of the great Master, did not Vasari, his own pupil and biographer, confess it. Suspicion was early excited by the undue interest shown by Angelo in Sebastiano's success, and at length all the facts were disclosed. When the matter came abroad, Raphael quietly observed: "I rejoice at the favor Michael Angelo does me, since he shows that he thinks me worthy to compete with himself and not with Sebastiano." It was partly the suspicion of this combined attempt to outstrip and humble him that led Raphael to gather up all his strength into one grand effort. Angelo's subject, the Raising of Lazarus, was a better theme for pictorial representation than Raphael's, as it admitted of greater dramatic effect. And yet, when they were publicly exhibited side by side, the palm of excellence was awarded to Raphael's. The former is now in the National Gallery, London, a work of no ordinary merit, but an object of little regard; the latter holds high court in the Vatican at Rome, and the reputation is world-wide. It is the one painting above all others to which travelers from every land resort, that they may behold the highest possible achievements of human art.

Certain critics complain of its want of unity. The glorified forms in the air above, it is said, constitute one picture, and the agitated group of mortals at the foot of the mountain, another. But a little inspection shows that the two scenes are essential parts of one design; each needing the contrast of the other, and made the more impressive by it. In the scene above, Christ hovers in the air, surrounded by an effulgence

of light. "He was transfigured before them, and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." The figures of Moses and Elias float in the atmosphere, as if drawn up and attracted by their Lord. The three disciples on the Mount prostrate themselves in adoring awe. The scene at the foot of the hill is connected with that at the top by the many hands uplifted and pointing to the Saviour. And the broad-masses of shade in the lower scene heighten the effect of the bright portions above. They are also connected symbolically; for, while the lower scene represents the condition of the world under the power of sin and Satanic influence, the upper reveals a promise of deliverance in the person of the divine Saviour. Could Art have done a nobler work than thus to give mankind an epitome of the gospel, and to make its last great effort in honor of Christ!

Raphael's career was destined to be short, as it was brilliant. Possessed of a delicate constitution, his life had also been spent in close study and intense mental activity. Ambitious to excel, and then to maintain his high position, he overworked himself, and exhausted his stock of vitality faster than it could be replenished. It would not be strange, either, if the luxurious style of living prevalent in the court of Leo tended to beget physical enervation, rather than masculine vigor. The immediate cause of his sickness and decline was a cold contracted by exposure after rapid walking in the streets of Rome. A fever ensued, which his overtaken energies could not resist, and which was only aggravated by the mal-practice of his physician. A fortnight of illness, and all was over. He had not given the finishing touches to his painting of the Transfiguration; he had not completed his survey of the topography and antiquities of the city; his career as an architect was only just opening before him; when suddenly the light of his genius was put out. He died on Good Friday, the day of his birth, just thirty-seven years old. His body lay in state at the head of the long apartment where he had painted the Transfiguration hanging upon the wall above him, in the full glow of its recent colors. When his scholars and personal

friends looked in upon the scene, they burst into tears and loud lamentations. Crowds of rich and poor came to witness his burial.

“ When Raphael went,
His heavenly face the mirror of his mind,
His mind a temple for all lovely things
To flock to and inhabit ; when he went,
Wrapt in his sable cloak, the cloak he won,
To sleep beneath the venerable dome
By those attended who in life had loved,
Had worshiped, following in his steps to fame,
(’Twas on an April day, when nature smiles,)
All Rome was there. But ere the march began,
Ere to receive their charge the bearers came,
Who had not sought him ? And, when all beheld
Him where he lay, how changed from yesterday
Him, in that hour cut off, and at his head
His last great work ; when, entering in, they looked
Now on the dead, then on the master-piece,
Now on his face, lifeless and colorless ;
Then on those forms divine that lived and breathed,
And would live on for ages ; all were moved ;
And sighs burst forth, and loudest lamentations.”

He was buried in the Pantheon, by the side of Maria di Bibbiena, to whom he had been betrothed.

The biographers of Raphael make little mention of his early education. It would seem, however, that such a father as his would not have neglected his mental training. During the eight years of his life at Perugia, doubtless the study of books in science and general learning occupied a share of his attention. It is known that he was well versed in history and poetry, and composed occasional sonnets. His letters are written in polished language. His researches in the department of antiquities, sacred and secular, and his varied studies in the literature of his profession, must have furnished him with large stores of knowledge. At the time of his death he was gathering materials for a comprehensive history of Art.

His social qualities were remarkable. The countenance shown in his portrait indicates gentleness and refinement of feeling, slightly touched with poetic melancholy. Nature had endowed him with sweetness of disposition, and the circumstances of his life were so ordered as little to disturb his

placid serenity. His affectionateness and generosity were illustrated in his devoting his first earnings for two years to the support of his step-mother and sister. At Perugia, Florence, and Rome, he made friends of all whom he met. For his early teacher, Perugino, he ever retained the warmest regard. And when Pope Julius ordered the paintings of all preceding artists in the Vatican to be destroyed, to make room for frescoes by Raphael, the latter interceded for the preservation of at least the works of Perugino. Instead of disparaging the productions of other masters, in order to exalt his own, he aimed simply and evermore at excellence. Learning something from others, he offered to teach those who would learn from him. He helped young artists in their studies, freely giving them his own designs, and not seldom laying aside his own works to aid them in theirs. That wordy chronicler of the painters, Vasari, hardly overstates the truth when he says of Raphael: "The power was accorded to him by Heaven of bringing all who approached his presence into harmony: an effect inconceivably surprising in our calling, and contrary to the nature of our artists. Yet all of every grade became as of one mind, once they began to labor in the society of Raphael, continuing in such unity and concord that all harsh feelings and evil dispositions became subdued, and disappeared in his presence; every vile and base thought vanishing before his influence. At no other time has such harmony prevailed. But this was caused by his surpassing all others in courtesy as well as art." To have thus commanded the love of his professional rivals, some of whom were older than himself, is proof of great dignity of character, goodness and wisdom. The exception to this in the case of Michael Angelo, is not so surprising when we consider the proud and overbearing spirit of this master, conscious of great abilities and ambitious of artistic pre-eminence. With Raphael, though by no means a perfect man, amiability, like his æsthetic feeling, was instinctive. It cost him little effort to be gracious and courteous to everybody. Yet again, it is highly to his credit, that, considering the flatteries he received from

the great and the learned, and the wealth and fame he acquired, he was not lifted up with pride, but in all changes of fortune continued modest and amiable to the last. A man of such a spirit must have possessed an inner life as fruitful of happiness to himself as it was beautiful in its outward expression. His sentiments, hopes, joys, sorrows and aspirations have found scant record in books, but many of them are inscribed on the pictured halls of the Vatican, and on the walls of palaces, churches, convents and galleries of art throughout Europe.

As to his relative position as an artist, we only repeat the judgment of centuries in placing him in the first rank. He could not have raised the standard of art so high above the low state in which he found it, or have accomplished such an amount of work in so short a life, without possessing pre-eminent abilities and great energy of character. It will not be maintained that he surpassed all others in specific fields of art. Angelo, and perhaps Da Vinci, excelled him in force of conception and scope of design; Titian, in brilliancy of coloring; Fra Angelico, in spirituality of expression; yet when the sum of gifts and attainments is considered, Raphael's completeness will lift him above all rivalry. And this is the more remarkable, since he attained this eminence before he had passed middle life.

Great as was his genius, he never supposed that it would ensure him success without labor. He seems to have adopted the definition of genius by a modern writer, as the capacity to work. Indeed his laboriousness gave the jealous Angelo occasion to say that his success was owing more to hard study than to genius. In his early Umbrian life, he showed "indescribable energy and application," learning whatever he could from books and nature, and from the instructions of Perugino. So at Florence, where the field of observation was so much wider, his mind expanded to embrace and profit by his opportunities. So also at Rome. It was no light thing for him to stand in the presence of genius, living and dead: it quickened his thoughts, fired his ambition, and spurred him on to

constant and earnest endeavor. On receiving any new commission, he at once sat down to the needful preparatory study, devoting to it weeks, and sometimes months in succession; and when he drew out his designs he gave them the highest bent of his faculties. This, in brief, was the history of his life, and was the secret of his success. Not that genius alone, or labor alone, would have made him the prince of painters, but labor united with genius; labor lifted up and inspired by genius, and genius controlled and made practical by labor.

It is a noteworthy circumstance that Raphael Sanzio and Martin Luther were born the same year, in Central Europe, and only a few hundred miles apart. The one contributed largely to adorn and make illustrious the Church of Rome, the other strove as earnestly to pull it down. What judgment shall be passed upon their respective lives and works? Shall we say of Raphael that he perverted his powers, and that his life was useless? Not so. For while some of his productions have given to the world false ideas of Christianity—just as some of Milton's poems have done—yet, on the whole, his works have been fruitful of good. His cartoons for the Sistine Chapel, his frescoes in the Vatican, and numerous other paintings, illustrate many of the great facts and truths of religion held in common by the universal church, and teach them to the world, age after age, with barely less impressiveness than it could be done by printed book or the human voice. Why not believe that such great artists, and poets likewise, are in a sense inspired of God to do a special work? Not a few excellent hymns have been written by men whose lives were far from religious. Shakspeare, for whose moral character no high claim will be set up, has written sentences which compel us to feel that surely a Divine breath spoke through him, and that he was half unconscious of what he uttered. The architects of the old cathedrals "buildd better than they knew." So we feel as we survey the life-work of such men as Raphael; they were in God's hand, led and controlled by him; and, though far from perfection, we cannot help feeling that they were raised up to do a great and good service for the race.

In concluding this article, we might refer at length to the criticisms which have been made on several of Raphael's works ; but our space will allow only an allusion to one which seems the best sustained, viz., that touching the anachronisms which appear in the accessories of many of his paintings. In the *Sistine Madonna*, for example, we have St. Sixtus with his robes and triple-crowned hat, on one side of Mary, and St. Barbara and the tower on the other. Those good-natured cherubs in the foreground we are rather glad to see there. In the *Madonna of the Fish*, we have, beside our blessed Lady, St. Jerome in cardinal robes, and the angel Raphael and the youthful Tobit. In several of his larger works, he introduces the faces of living popes, cardinals, and other personal friends into his groups of historical personages who lived centuries before. Now, to our unsophisticated eyes, it seems in questionable taste thus to trifle with the dignity of art, and to construct historical paintings which in their parts are historically untrue.

But such, we suppose, was the fashion of the times, and Raphael wished to please his munificent patrons, and to glorify holy Mother Church. It will be said, too, that these licenses were taken only in the subordinate parts of his pictures, and do not affect their main purpose. Therefore we will not press our complaint. How can we indulge in petty fault-finding, in the presence of such overshadowing excellencies? As we said at the beginning of these pages, we would rather survey *Mont Blanc* from the plain than from its sides. And so will we continue to look at Raphael, not only not disenchanted, but with increased admiration for his genius and his works.

ART. IV.—THE REFORMED CHURCH OF FRANCE.

[This article is extracted from *The British Quarterly Review* for April. It presents an admirable sketch of the present ecclesiastical crisis in the Reformed Church of France. The previous portion of the article reviewed those points in the history of this church, during the present century, with which we are more familiar; showing its position under Napoleon, the depressing influence of its dependence upon the State, and the progress of opinion in respect to the separation of Church and State, to which question the ecclesiastical contest now converges more and more. The services of Samuel Vincent, of Vivet, and of Adolphe Monod, are correctly appreciated. At the time at which our extracts begin, the *Archives du Christianisme* was vigorously propagating the evangelical cause; and *Le Semeur*, edited by M. Lutteroth, was conducted in the spirit of Vivet, advocating the separation of Church and State. M. F. Monod stated the motto of the Evangelical party in the National Church, in the following form: "We will act with the consistories wherever we can, without them if we find it necessary, and against them if they compel us so to do." The journal *Le Lien* edited by the elder Coquerel, defended the support of worship by the State from the rationalistic point of view. *L'Espérance* was the organ of the orthodox party, which approved of the union of Church and State. The orthodox party had also now become so strong that they could form the *Society for Promoting the General Interests of Protestantism* on such a basis as to exclude the Rationalistic party. The *Central Evangelical Society*, of an earlier date, also promoted evangelical views. Such was the general state of the church at the time that this narrative opens. The account of Guizot's course, and the extracts from his remarkable oration, will attract special interest.—EDITORS.]

SUCH was the position of French Protestantism when the Revolution of 1848 burst forth. This unlooked-for convulsion threw everything into uncertainty. Institutions the most deeply rooted tottered under the stormy wind now passing over the whole European continent. But it was soon perceived that the new Republic would be very lenient, and would interfere but little with the constitution of French society. After the first moments of terror, the extreme partisans of the union of Church and State were re-assured. Many of them, no doubt, regretted having, in an official meeting held at Paris three months after the events of February, urged the convocation of a Synod. When once decided, however, it could not be adjourned; and in the month of September, 1848, the first Synod of the Reformed Church in the

nineteenth century was convened. The elections, in the absence of precise laws, were marked by numerous irregularities ; but it was certainly, on the whole, a fair representation of the churches. As the Synod had not been sanctioned by the Government, none of its decisions had the force of law. Its importance was therefore simply moral ; but in this point of view it was not small, since the project of organization which it laid down has remained like a stake in the ground, by which the road since traversed may be measured. The first question discussed was that of the constitutional basis of the Reformed Church of France ; and the subject was treated by MM. F. Monod and Agenor de Gasparin with a precision which left nothing to be desired. They demanded that the Synod should decree the principle that the Reformed Church, as a whole, like the Christian Church, rests on a confession of faith. The discussion was very full and very animated. The Rationalistic party took up its old theme of universal toleration. The majority of the orthodox, feeling very sure that the Assembly would not vote a confession of faith, asserted that the traditional belief of the Church had never been abrogated, and that it was adequately expressed in the confession of faith as well as in the liturgies. One is surprised that such an argument should have been allowed ; for of what avail is a document which really binds no one in a wholly moral society ? It is the present belief that one requires to know ; not that of former generations. Under the inspiration of these different motives, the following order of the day was voted : "The Assembly, seeing that it is proved on examination of the papers of the Consistorial Assembly that the generality of churches have expressed the wish that its deliberations should not touch upon dogmatic questions, and also that it is evident from the discussion in which it has just engaged that the moment has not yet arrived to disturb the *statu quo* in this respect, reserves these questions, and resolves that a commission shall be immediately named to prepare the plan of an address to the churches as a preamble to a subsequent project of administration."

The address voted was a vague homily woven of Scripture texts well known to be understood in different senses by the various members of the Assembly. But it was no such equivocal document that could pass for a profession of Christian faith in a Synod where, according to the vigorous expression of M. F. Monod, the distance between one party and another was as great as that between two different religions. All that was gained was that the confession of faith of La Rochelle was virtually laid aside; that it would no longer have the force of law, and would bind no one in the Church unless it should be placed at the head of a new project of organization. It was thus that the representatives of the Church ratified the elimination of the rule of doctrine and discipline which the State had in fact abrogated on occasion of the dismissal of M. A. Monod. The confirmed *statu quo* involved the absence of any dogmatic basis, since the pastors were nominated and approved without any profession being legally demanded, each consistory acting just as it liked in this respect. An evangelical consistory would of course be directed in its choice by the known convictions of a candidate; but of any general or ecclesiastical rule there was not a trace. Now, even if we suppose that, at the time of the treaty with the State, the legislature had explicitly ratified the confession of faith and the rule of discipline (which was not the case,) still the vote of the Synod of 1848 was sufficient to establish that the old doctrinal rule had been legally set aside. As to the constitution which resulted from the deliberations of the Assembly, it would be useless to dwell on it, since it has never been brought into operation. We will confine ourselves to stating that the synodal system was re-established, but that nothing appears among the characteristics of the Synod implying the existence of a confession of faith. What is more important is, the absence of all religious conditions in the electoral regulations. This is the essential point of the significant Article No. 2.: "The elders shall be named by the Protestants aged twenty-five, who have been for a year in the church, can prove their first communion, and recognize the Bible as the Word of God,

and the only rule of faith." It was, moreover, understood that this last clause should merely be read from the pulpit without the electors being required to express their individual assent. Such a regulation in a church in which the interpretations of the essential doctrines of the Gospel were radically different one from another, had no real efficacy. A man was qualified to enter on the pastoral office by having his diploma, being a Frenchman, and receiving consecration from seven pastors. The greatest blessing that has fallen on the Reformed Church of France was that the sanction of Government was not obtained for this miserable project, devised, no doubt conscientiously, as the best that could be procured from so mixed an assembly, but which sanctioned the equivocations and imperfections of a false position. The true meaning of the project was shown by the resignation of MM. A de Gasparin and F. Monod. The latter, pastor of the most important church in France, unhesitatingly abandoned his fine position, because his conscience no longer permitted him to serve a Church which had, of its own free will, sanctioned an irregularity intolerable in his eyes. This resignation is one of the acts most honorable to contemporary French Protestantism; for whatever judgment we may form of it from an ecclesiastical point of view, we cannot but accord to it unreserved admiration if we estimate at their true worth disinterested sacrifices to truth and to conscience.

It was shortly after these events that the free churches already existing in France formed a synodal association, founded on the double principle of the separation of Church and State, and the individual profession of faith. This organization, amid many difficulties, is still in full vigor. Nor is it a fact of small importance, that an independent Church should exist, resting on true principles, and serving as a vanguard to the Evangelical party. It offers a safe refuge, and at the same time a practical lesson, amidst the gloomy struggles of the present day.

From 1848 to 1851, the Reformed Church returned to the old system; the new organization not acting for a single day,

and the consistories continuing to be recruited from the most highly taxed of the community. But all was changed after the events of December 1851, which placed France for some months under a dictatorial rule. No one knew at night what would be decreed on the morrow. Those who enjoyed surprises may have found something to compensate them for the loss of political liberty. One fine morning, March 26, 1852, the Reformed Church of France awoke constituted anew, without having to grope through all the difficulties of a long deliberation. There could be no question of synods in an organization born under the inspiration of the *régime* of December, which no one will accuse of an exaggerated tenderness for deliberative assemblies. Councils of presbyters replaced the local consistories, and were themselves connected with the general consistories. The electoral law established universal suffrage, without requiring any conditions but those of age, residence, a certificate of first communion, and a vague profession of attachment to the established worship. There was here evidently no adequate guarantee for evangelical faith. The councils of presbyters were to be partially renewed every third year. This fine system was completed by the establishment of a central council chosen for the first time, at least by the State, which was to mediate between the churches and the civil power. The characteristics of this new body were not clearly defined. It might easily become despotic. At all events, it was the cause of great anxiety to all who were concerned for the liberties of the Church. This was not the case with the leaders of the Rationalistic party. They found it very convenient to have a sort of civil magistracy at the head of the Church, since they were very sure that it was not from that side that they need apprehend the introduction of disturbing religious reforms. A most animated discussion marked the conferences held at Paris in the spring of 1852. The Evangelical party demanded from whence had come "this thunderbolt," and with whom had originated this re-organization which the Government would never have devised for itself. Strange sayings were repeated that had been uttered

before witnesses, implying that a Government which had done away with a political assembly might also, at its pleasure, change the organization of a Church. It was; in fact, very well known whence the first idea of the decree had come, and no one would need other proof of this who observed from what party it received expressions of affection that had all the blindness of paternal feeling. It seemed like a repetition of the famous judgment of Solomon.

But it was in vain to discuss or to protest. The decree was in full force. The debates at this period turned rather upon its applications. The Evangelical party sought to reduce the powers of the Central Council as far as possible, while the rationalists openly demanded their extension. This latter party committed a great imprudence. Its chief leader, the pastor A. Coquerel the elder, published a project of discipline, which contained the two following articles: "Art. 166. The Central Council is composed of thirty-one members; that is to say, ten pastors in office, twenty elders, and the sub-director of all public worship that is not Catholic." "Art. 167. The ten pastors are named by decree. Each consistory places one of its lay members on the general list of the hundred and five elders presented by the consistories; the Government chooses the twenty lay members of the Council who are named by decree, as is also the president." In other words, a Government Commission was to rule the Church instead of its own Synods. And this is what men dared to demand in the name of liberalism! The Church is surrendered to the civil power, because it is feared that, left to herself, she should awake and commit the intolerable presumption of professing a definite faith and ordering her own discipline. The Evangelical party was induced, by the attitude of its adversaries, to demand more urgently the re-establishment of the Synods. There was one moment, indeed, when the rationalistic party appeared to join in this movement, but the agreement did not last long. The partisans of doctrinal anarchy soon recognized that the Synods would be dangerous for them, and they hesitated not to abjure the most glorious tradition of

their Church by opposing the re-establishment of its most necessary institutions. This question of Synods provoked very animated discussion, which had the advantage of showing to what extent Rationalistic liberalism was prepared to sacrifice the freedom of the religious community to the civil power, provided that power would guarantee its own safety; that is to say, the continuance of that ecclesiastical disorder which permitted the co-existence of radical divergences within the same Church.

We have now reached the most agitated period of the ecclesiastical crisis; but in order to understand its true character, we must look at the theological crisis which arose in France nearly fifteen years ago. If the old Rationalistic party had remained such as it had been for forty years,—faithful, that is, to a dull and frigid supernaturalism,—it would not have caused the scandals and aroused the opposition which have made so great a stir in modern times. We shall regard the theological crisis only in its relation to the ecclesiastical one, for it would, of course, be impossible to describe it fully in a few pages.

The old Rationalism had come from Geneva, and had preserved its prudent and moderate character, uttering no rash negations, but contenting itself with quietly taking out, or at least passing over, the tragic and sublime side of revelation—all that the Bible calls the foolishness of the cross. Superficial minds accordingly imagined that it was unjustly charged with assailing the essence of Christianity. As it led to no scandals, a goodly number of pious men, attached to the Evangelical faith, thought that they ought not to declare open war with it, and that an equilibrium should be maintained between the two parties. With a clear conscience, they yielded to compromises that were full of danger for the future. They occasionally voted for pastors well known for their attachment to the rationalistic party. But after the year 1852 all was changed. The prudence and timidity of the Genevan theology was followed by German boldness. A stormy breeze

from Germany passed over the minds of men, and they were led by degrees to extreme negations,—to that point, *i. e.*, where all positive religion is at an end. The first shock of this new movement was given by a very important event, which occasioned violent debates. This was the resignation by M. Edmond Scherer of his professorship of theology at the Oratoire at Geneva, in which his colleagues were MM. Gausson and Merle d'Aubigné. This act is well known to have been induced by a letter on the Holy Scriptures, in which the learned theologian decidedly rejected the notion of any special inspiration for our sacred books.

To comprehend the sense and bearing of this important act, which led to consequences so momentous, we must cast a rapid glance at the condition of French Protestant theology at this period. We need not speak of the rationalistic party, which had not then got beyond a supernaturalistic Socinianism. Unanimity on all points no longer existed in the Evangelical camp, as at the beginning of the revival. There was, undoubtedly, a general agreement in accepting the great essential doctrines of Christianity; but while some interpreted these doctrines in the strict sense of the orthodoxy of the revival, which had been but a reflection of that of the seventeenth century, others had felt the necessity of widening their doctrinal system. They rightly deemed that the human and moral element was not sufficiently recognized by the reigning theology, which presented the dogma of predestination without any modification, and identified inspiration with an absolute *théopneustie*. These moderate views were traceable to Vinet, in the countries where French was spoken, and in Germany to the Evangelical liberal theology represented by such illustrious men as Neander, Tholuck, Julius Müller, Ullmann, and Dorner. It is important to prove that what has since been wrongly called the third party, was already constituted before the theological "left" had engaged in the conflict; for this fact shows that the change did not arise from a compromise, but from a deep and serious need of the mind and spirit. Therefore is it that we find this party in the present day fully

developed, pursuing its work with faith and courage, and continually drawing into its ranks those who wish neither to renounce the everlasting Gospel, nor to abstain from the earnest and conscientious treatment of the questions originated by modern thought. M. Scherer, after having first professed rigid orthodoxy, attached himself later to the liberal evangelical party, and from his vast learning, and his admirable talent as an ingenious and pointed writer, became one of its most eminent representatives. He exerted immense influence over the students of the Oratoire, and defended the cause of Christian individualism in his journal, *La Réformation*, with a zeal often implacable, but always brilliant. The views dominant in the Oratoire at Geneva were those of the old orthodoxy, with all its most characteristic features. The celebrated historian of the Reformation, M. Merle d'Aubigné, had not been required by the nature of his work to define his opinions with so much precision as his venerated colleague, M. Gaussen,—a man distinguished alike for his qualities of mind and heart, and universally regarded with most affectionate respect. His well-known work on "*La Théopneustie*," stated the dogma of plenary inspiration with a strictness such as our Reformers had never known, refusing even to a moderate religious criticism all its legitimate rights. M. Scherer's letter contained an energetic protest against these exaggerations; but it was easy to see in it the first symptoms of a reaction, which might lead very far if it were not held under restraint. The shock through the religious world was great, but no one expected the crisis that would follow. There was very soon founded at Strasburg a "*Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*," conducted with superior talent by MM. Colani and Scherer.

It was not known as yet how far they were going. At first, it seemed that nothing was intended but a scientific journal in which the opinions of all sides might be represented. The adherents of the Evangelical liberal theology gave therefore their support to the new "*Revue*." But the good understanding could not last long. It soon became evident that on one very grave point MM. Colani and Scherer separated them-

selves from the great Christian tradition—that they held very lightly by the eternal Divinity of Christ. On the question of authority, they advocated an absolute subjectivity, admitting even that, in case of opposition between the individual conscience and Christ, the former must be obeyed. The “*Revue de Théologie*” very soon cast away the opinions which would have served it for ballast, and spread all sail towards new shores. It raised at one and the same time all the problems, critical and metaphysical, which had disturbed the theology of Germany during the last half-century, and it did this with the precision and subtlety of the French mind, boldly dispersing all vagueness and obscurity. This sudden invasion of the negative German science produced a great sensation, especially on youthful minds, thrown without preparation into the vortex. From criticism the “*Revue*” passed to metaphysics. It had begun by elevating the conscience to supreme authority. A breath of mysticism pervaded its first writings, even when their conclusions were negative. But by degrees this influence disappeared, and the name of reason was wholly substituted for that of conscience. The notion of the supernatural gradually subsided. M. Scherer's last article in the “*Revue*” may be regarded as his farewell to theology, and it is the farewell of a gloomy sadness, ending in scepticism. He has since devoted himself altogether to pure literature, and has become the rival of M. de Sainte Beuve, in a system which may be called *Nihilism*, since it admits not in theory any definite principles, starting from nothing to arrive at nothing, and asking if all be not an infinite illusion. From this moment theology has no claim to inquire into the labors of M. Scherer. He has placed himself on a shifting ground, where we can neither reach nor follow him. His old friends have continued the work that had been begun, but without the enthusiasm that marks new undertakings. The “*Revue*” has not since excited the same lively interest that formerly secured for it so great an influence. Its editor, M. Colani, has only written in it at rare intervals. If he has not followed M. Scherer to his furthest point, he has more and more resolutely eliminated

the supernatural element from religion, and he has been followed in this path by almost all his fellow-laborers. It is strange that in this negative belief, two systems, once so different, have met at last,—the bold and mystical spirit which created the “*Revue de Théologie*,” and the old Genevan and French rationalism. This fusion is one of the characteristic signs of the position of men’s minds. It was not possible that the mitigated rationalism which flourished in calmer days should long resist the new influences that had just arisen. It tried hard through some of its recognized leaders to maintain its former position. After the resignation of M. Scherer, MM. Munier and Chenevière, professors at Geneva, published refutations of his letter, in which they defended the authority of the Holy Scriptures. Some years later, M. Coquerel the elder, brought out a “*Christologie*,” rather Arian than Socinian, and in which the favorite theses of supernaturalism were put forth. But how could the party, as a whole, defend itself against the new theology? It was only connected with a supernaturalistic Christianity by an external tie that touched not the heart or conscience. On another side it had always asserted the unlimited freedom of religious thought. How then should it say, “Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther?” Moreover, it was not burdened with much science, while the new school had a vast amount of learning always ready for use. It is not surprising, therefore, that the “*Revue de Théologie*” should have gradually absorbed the old rationalistic party. No alliance succeeded better than this, in an age when every kind was tried. Let us remember also, that orthodoxy in its various gradations furnished its contingent to the new rationalism, and has, indeed, given it some of its boldest champions. It has not, however, been itself broken up, like the old rationalism. It has had defections, but has not lost its colors in the fight. Never, on the contrary, did it own more adherents than at the present day.

We must allow, however, that the rationalistic party—or the Liberal party, as it prefers to call itself—has advanced with great strides in the path of transcendental negations. It

would be unjust indeed to attribute the same opinions to all its adherents; but of what account are individual divergencies when it is once well understood that even the few who have kept somewhat behind the rest, by retaining some shreds of the great Christian tradition, attach no importance to them, since they give the right hand of fellowship to those of extreme views, and show themselves always disposed to plead their cause in an ecclesiastical point of view. We are warranted, therefore, in disregarding these slight differences, which exert no influence over the progress of minds. The progress of the rationalistic party reminds one of a steeple-chase, each one recklessly trying to get before the others. In order to give some idea of what we may call this *fever of negation*, it will be sufficient if we mention some significant publications. After M. Scherer, and since his recent movements, M. Albert Réville has been the most marked man in the camp. He presents a striking example of the transformation that has been wrought in the old rationalism. The son of a venerable pastor, who during the whole course of his ministry decidedly promoted supernaturalism by his words and his writings, and who was the friend of Archbishop Whately and the translator of his works, M. Albert Réville began his course in the same direction. But he soon broke through his leading-strings, and took up his position by writing witty and learned articles for the journal *Le Lien*. His genius took a high flight. Gifted with a remarkable fluency of style, a mind at once lively and singularly logical, he speedily became one of the most influential members of the theological "left,"—one indeed of its recognized leaders. He was fortunate enough moreover, thanks to his talents, to get into the "*Revue des deux Mondes*," which, of all French literary journals, has the largest circulation. And he mounted this rostrum, from which he could be heard so far, to maintain the most decided naturalism. We shall not be doing him an injustice if we say that what was most characteristic in his opinions was precisely the denial of all supernatural elements in religion. This is not with him a principle that has to be extracted by argument

from a mass of other ideas, but one which he constantly and openly advocates. The laws of nature are in his view a permanent and necessary mode of the Divine activity, and cannot therefore have been superseded in any case—the supernatural would be the *super-Divine!*—which implies an obvious contradiction. Henceforth Christianity is nothing more than the natural evolution of humanity. This humanity appears on the surface of the globe. How? No one knows. It first exhibits itself physically—animal life predominates in its early stages. By degrees it rises through all successive religions till it reaches its ideal in the man Jesus, in whom the Divine idea shines forth in all its brilliance. Thus all fundamental doctrines vanish—the fall as well as the redemption—and nothing is left to us but a wholly human religion. We are not attempting to criticise the system, but only stating its essential bearings. This, then, is what M. Albert Réville teaches in his numerous writings, what he preaches with force and clearness in the churches of France that are open to him, when, leaving his own church at Rotterdam, he frequently makes tours among them in compliance with the numerous requests addressed to him. The same denial of the supernatural is said to be found also in the writings of M. Pécaut, who has made himself universally respected by the religious tone of his mind, maintained throughout the varying phases of his doctrinal notions. He published in 1859 a book entitled “*Le Christ et la Conscience*,” in which, not content with removing every miraculous element from religion, he questioned the perfect sanctity of Jesus Christ, and tried to show that the Scripture words could not rightly be applied to Him: “He was in all things like as we are, *yet without sin*.” The issue of M. Pécaut’s system was to reduce the true religion to the elements of a theism without dogma or miracle. He maintained the same thesis in a second book entitled “*Le Théisme Chrétien*,” published in 1864. In this as in the former work he confessed that there was no place in the actual Church in its present state for views such as his, and gave his readers to understand that a new framework must be created for doctrines so new.

His first book had been criticised in the rationalistic camp, which had hitherto insisted on the person of Christ as being the centre of religion. The notion of the ideal man which M. Réville had set forth, was rudely assailed by this bold attack against the moral perfection of Jesus. The second of M. Pécaut's books on the contrary was received by the party with eulogiums, with one exception. He was reproached for wishing to teach his doctrine outside the Church. Why did he not assert the unlimited freedom of religious thought? M. Pécaut seems to have been convinced by these fine reasonings, for in his last work, "*De l'Avenir du Protestantisme*," he openly claims his place within the limits of official Protestantism. He maintains that his views have as much right as any others to be produced within the Church, and that in fact through them alone will the Church be able to realize the grand future to which it is destined. This new position which M. Pécaut has taken up is of very great importance, for it denotes to what extent public opinion has advanced in this direction. That which would have appeared some years ago an unwarranted presumption, is now regarded as a matter of course. The work of M. Théophile Bost, a Belgian pastor, on Liberal Protestantism, teaches the same doctrines, and puts forth the same pretensions in a tone incomparably more assuming. This book and the Catechism of M. Réville may be regarded as the last word that has been heard from the party, and this—the last word—is still the denial of the supernatural; it is a sort of mitigated stoicism, tinged with a slight biblical coloring. The younger M. Coquerel, who had for a long time believed in the supernatural, has lately written a book, "*Les Transformations du Christianisme*," in which, without denying miracles, he asserts their utter inutility, and reduces religion to a simple moral development going on through incessant fluctuations under the gracious and purifying influence of Jesus Christ. It is quite certain that at the present hour the consistent naturalists have the preponderating influence in the Liberal camp. The most popular preachers—those of whom the party most loudly boasts—the most openly

deny the miraculous. Such are M. Fontanés (of Hâvre), Pellissier, and Réville. The fact is patent and incontestable. Theirs is the grand Christianity, that which is to reconcile the age and the Gospel, and to which all superior minds unconsciously belong. Miracles and dogmas are useless excrescences, from which we must as soon as possible deliver the essence of religion, which consists simply in love to God and man. It is a sacred ether,—a divine and impalpable breath which, since the time of Jesus, has passed over the human soul. It must be confessed that, in studying these preachers of the Liberal School, it is impossible to discover anything but this under the flowers of their rhetoric, making, however, one exception in favor of M. Colani, who preaches duty with a manly energy, but without giving it its needful supports. It is incontestable that the extreme views are those chiefly represented in the journals of the ecclesiastical "left." M. Etienne Coquerel, the clever editor of *Le Lien*, has not concealed his convictions, but has repeatedly declared that he repels the notion of the supernatural. Some of his fellow-workers (his brother especially) have not gone so far; but it is certain that the journal defends at all points and against all opponents those "good Christians" who do not admit a single miracle, and that M. Réville is one of its most constant and distinguished contributors. *Le Disciple de Jésus Christ*, conducted by M. Martin Paschaud, has for a long time dropped all concealment. Its estimable editor has reduced Christianity to what the last century called "natural religion." When M. Pécaut's book appeared in 1859, openly denying the perfect holiness of Christ, M. Martin Paschaud expressed in his journal his hope that the approaching jubilee of the Reformation would be celebrated in the spirit of this excellent work. Since then this journal—in which MM. A. Réville, Pécaut, Fontanés, and Théophile Bost are the principal writers—has not ceased to unfold to every breeze the banner of natural Christianity. A small journal, also, entitled *Le Protestant Libéral*, has taken on itself to disseminate among its numerous readers the most daring negations, under a lively and piquant

form. It aims to render these amusing, teaching the astonished public, for example, what to think of the apostles who spent their time in disputes among themselves. Let it not be forgotten that this denial of the supernatural appeared in the Church at the very moment when in the most perfidious manner Christianity was attacked from without, when the "Vie de Jésus" by M. Renan was selling by thousands of copies, and when the principal political journals were ranging themselves under its banner. We can understand the importance that would at such a time attach to internal assaults in the eyes of believers who think, whether rightly or wrongly, that Christianity is no longer a religion when deprived of the supernatural element. We have thought it desirable to give a just notion of the circumstances under which the ecclesiastical crisis had to be encountered, for it owed in fact its chief importance to the growing complications of the theological crisis.

We shall now proceed to concentrate our attention upon the last two years. During this time the electoral struggle has assumed an extraordinary animation. Two facts, however, belonging to a previous period, must be noticed, one of which is the foundation of the universal Christian alliance, which essayed to melt into an equal insipidity all shades of religion—Catholic, Protestant, and Greek—but has never succeeded in exciting the least interest. Undertakings of this kind, which propose to secure the union of creeds by suppressing all their definite, manly, and vigorous character, and would thus bind together not affirmations but negations, not strength but weakness, are doomed to unproductiveness, and must speedily fade and die away. The same is not to be said of the second creation of the Rationalistic party; we mean the *Union libérale*, a vast association composed exclusively of laymen, having no other object than to work for the triumph of emancipated Protestantism. The first principle of this union is that no standard should exist, or at any rate should be displayed in the Church, but that of free inquiry, and this should cover all opinions with its shadow. *L'Union libérale* is, as it were,

the incarnation of the preaching of the elder M. Coquerel. Above all, it is a great electoral engine, designed to overpower the Evangelical party in the ballot, which decides the direction of the Church of Paris; for it is there that its efforts are mainly concentrated, though some shoots have been struck in the provinces. We may notice, also, the animated discussion raised by the question of a new translation of the Bible. No one asserts the excellence of the existing translations, but the Liberal party wished that the Protestant Bible Society should edit the version made at Geneva in 1834, and regarded by the orthodox with much suspicion. The majority of the committee having voted in favor of the proposal made by the Liberal party, a schism ensued, and was followed by the formation of a new Bible Society for the Evangelicals—this schism furnishing another illustration of the incompatibility of the two parties.

We will turn now to the beginning of the year 1864. We know what was the state of the general mind, for we find ourselves in the very midst of the doctrinal crisis which we have described. The Evangelical party could not witness calmly the bold attempt to exchange the everlasting Gospel for a gospel without miracles. It believed, with reason, that as concerns the safety of the Church, those who allow Theistic Naturalism to be preached within it, are no less dangerous than those who preach it themselves. It was under these circumstances that the council of presbyters at Paris was called on to deliberate about renewing the license of the younger M. Coquerel, who for several years had been assistant to M. Martin Paschaud. We may well regret that the first measure of ecclesiastical severity should have fallen on a man who inspired general esteem and sympathy. M. Coquerel was the favorite preacher of the Liberal party, and he deserved this favor by his sustained and attractive talents, and by a remarkable faculty of rendering his sermons interesting without transgressing the dignity of the pulpit. All that could be charged on his preaching amounted to certain omissions—important ones indeed—but he had never attacked from the pulpit the

fundamental dogmas of Christianity. Yet, under his simple elegance and the fervor of his manner, the holy savor of evangelical Christianity could not be found, although the orator had maintained his belief in the supernatural, and distinctly preached the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

To refuse to renew his license would be therefore to take a very bold step, the effect of which upon public opinion would be immense, for it would amount to a declaration that the time for a compromise was past. Let us recognize at the same time what no one can gainsay,—i. e., that M. Coquerel, moderate as he had shown himself as a preacher, had openly taken up the defence of the Liberal party; that he had accepted and advocated its thesis of universal toleration, and had committed himself to its support in the pulpit, and, above all, in the journal *Le Lien*. He was indeed the most approved representative of the party, not in its extreme tendencies, but in its average opinions. The Consistory was required then to decide whether it would of its own free will give the sanction of its vote to views, which the majority of its members believed to be morally dangerous to the Church. Nor must we forget that in this important affair there could be no question of recourse to the civil power, for it devolved entirely on the Consistory to decide as the last appeal. There was, therefore, no interference to be expected from the State—nothing need be considered but the welfare of the Church. No one has ever questioned or could ever question the legality of the measure by which the Consistory refused to maintain M. Coquerel in his position of assistant minister. It has only been asserted that in a Church united to the State, and divided into two almost equal parties, satisfaction should have been given to both. But this is only an argument of expediency. If the majority of the Consistory really believed that the continuance of the licence was dangerous for the Church, it was bound to act as it did—its duty was to follow the right to the end. But it was certainly taking the first step in a path full of dangers. The attempt to reconstruct a church of Christian profession within the forms of a national establish-

ment, could not but issue as we shall see it did. It mattered not, however; it was right that the experiment should be made, and whatever were the clamors and protestations raised against it, the Consistory did certainly obey the most solemn requirements of the Christian conscience in risking its own existence by so decisive an act. We shall find that by the very necessities of the conflict, a notion of a Church very different from that which had hitherto been found sufficient, was gradually to prevail in the minds of men. For the Church as a school would be exchanged a Church consisting of Christian professors. Only the more distinctly this, the true notion, should be defined, the more would the obstacles be felt which arise from the union with the State.

Scarcely was the consistorial decision known in Paris when the most violent storm burst forth. A petition was presented with numerous signatures; protests poured in from all parts of the country. Nothing could be more comprehensible than this agitation, for the Liberal party was struck to the heart, and the conflict of opinion was touching its culminating point. Pastoral conferences of two kinds are held every spring at Paris on occasion of the annual meetings of the different religious societies—the one called General, because it comprehends the pastors of all denominations; the other composed exclusively of pastors connected with the national establishment. One subject only could be discussed in the spring of 1864—that, namely, which filled and excited all minds, and which had been brought before the public attention by the important act of the Consistory of Paris in regard to the younger M. Coquerel. The measure itself could not indeed be discussed, but only the principle which had inspired it, and this principle involved the grave problem: "Ought the Church, or ought it not, to rest upon definite beliefs, or should it throw itself open to all opinions?" This is what was debated from different points of view at the two conferences. The general one opened on Tuesday, the 5th of April. The question that was discussed during three days was thus stated: "Are not the existence of a Church and the rights of believ-

ers compromised by unrestricted liberty in religious teaching?" The debate was marked by extraordinary animation on both sides. The Evangelical party in the national Church no less than in the Independent one asserted very strongly the necessity that a Church should have a dogmatic basis—a common rule accepted by all. "I demand," said M. Bersier, "if one can conceive of a Church without such a basis. I ask how a Mormon or a Spiritualist shall be prevented from preaching his doctrines, or a Puseyite from raising his altar and lighting his tapers, in our churches. Much has been said of the rights of pastors. I am here to assert the rights of the laity. A political journal has put forward a thesis on this subject which has not been disavowed: it is that a pastor who has received his license is answerable to no one—it is the license that constitutes the pastor. Well, I say that this is the most frightful tyranny that has ever been dreamed of. A priest is at least answerable to his bishop, but a pastor would find himself in the position of the doctor in *Le Malade Imaginaire*—those who give him his diploma saying to him, 'I confer on you the power to teach whatever you wish. Attack the faith of your fathers—mutilate the Bible—tread the liturgy under foot—do anything you like—you are free!'"

The Liberal party has not indeed ventured to claim unrestricted liberty in teaching: it would have been too flagrant an absurdity; but this concession was reduced to nothing by declarations such as that of the pastor Cruveilliér: "We preach the truth as we find it in the Bible, interpreted by our reason and our conscience;" or that of the Pastor Vidal: "We are asked where are the limits of truth? For my part, I have two: my first is the Word of God; my second, conscience." In other words, every one in a given church has the right to teach that which in the Scriptures is suited to his conscience; which means that there are no definite beliefs at the basis of the religious community. "I will answer you frankly," said the pastor Collins. "Of limits placed by man we will have none—absolutely none; neither pope, nor council, nor *synod*. The authority of a book I recognize; but that any one should

come and say to me, in the name of a book, "You shall teach this or that," I will not permit. Where, then, shall be the element of order? It shall be in liberty itself—in the name of a Christian Church united to Jesus Christ."

"This, then, is clear. No Church has the right to impose any other rule on its teachers than the vague assertion of the authority of the Scriptures, not venturing even to define what that authority is. It is evident that, even at a time when doctrinal differences are so profound, a shelter so elastic will include them all. MM. Rognon, Bersier, Dhombres, and G. Monod, responded forcibly to these sophisms. They showed that, if it is true that no Church has the right of imposing a rule of faith on any man, or of placing itself between him and the Holy Scriptures, it is yet both the right and the duty of every Church to declare distinctly what is in its view the fundamental basis on which it ought to rest—to say what it believes to be essential in matters of doctrine, and, like every association that wishes to endure, to claim respect for that which we may call its social conscience. The debate went on amid a real tempest, so over excited were all minds. One of the orators of the "left," the minister Lombard, called forth the most earnest protestations when he declared that prudence dictated to a pastor to keep his private opinions to himself at the time of public worship. There is no Protestant assembly, thank God, that would let pass the theory of mental reservation, without lively indignation. And yet we shall find that such a theory was adopted and defended by a small portion of the Liberal party. It is but just, here, to make a marked exception in favor of the pastor Leblois, who declared, in full conference, that he understood the name Son of God as applied to Jesus Christ in the same sense as that in which we apply it to ourselves.

At length the following motion, drawn up by M. Rognon, was carried by a large majority :

"The Conference, after having deliberated on the question placed on the order of the day, by the motion of the pastors

Bersier and Dhombres, and thus expressed : ' Are not the existence of a Church and the rights of believers compromised by unrestricted liberty in religious teaching ?'

" Considering that for some years opinions have been put forth in works of every kind, by the periodical press, in political journals, and even in manuals of religious instruction, under the names of pastors and professors of theology, which assail not only the fundamental principle of the divine authority of the Scriptures, hitherto recognized by all the Churches of the Reformation, but also the most elementary principles of Christianity :

" Considering also that the writers referred to question the authority of the greater part of the Saviour's teaching, as it has been preserved for us in the Gospels ; ignore or deny his supernatural birth, his miracles, and, above all, his resurrection ; overthrow not merely the Christian idea of the creation of man in the image of God, and of his fall, but the very foundations also of natural religion, by weakening the belief in the Divine personality and in the future judgment :

" Considering, finally, that the authors of these negations justify themselves by alleging that it is of the very essence of a Protestant Church to admit of unrestricted freedom in religious teaching,—is of opinion, on the motion of the pastor Rognon, that as to what concerns the very existence of a Church, the free expression, whether by preaching or by any other public and official means, of the doctrinal opinions of the pastors, has for its legitimate and necessary limit the beliefs professed by the religious community to which these pastors owe their call :

" That, as to what pertains to the rights of believers, the authority which their sacred office gives to the pastors is entirely dependent on the conformity of their instructions with the teachings of the Bible, and particularly with the fundamental doctrines of the divinity of Christ and of Redemption, which doctrines the universal church has always regarded as unquestionably contained in the Holy Scriptures, and which are expressed in all Protestant liturgies ; and that, con-

sequently, it is an abuse of power, and an act of spiritual tyranny, to take advantage of the position of a minister of Christ, and of a Christian church, to propagate directly or indirectly contrary doctrines."

We must not forget that this resolution, coming from an assembly which has no official character, and which is composed of members of different churches, has only a moral value, and could exert no influence over the position of the Reformed Church. The resolution passed at the conferences composed of pastors of the Established Church alone is no doubt of greater importance; but even that could not alter existing facts, nor arm the ecclesiastical bodies with a new right to repress doctrinal disorders. The following motion, made by M. Pédézet, professor at Montauban, was first inscribed on the order of the day: "I propose to the Conference to declare that the Reformed Church of France is possessed of positive doctrines, and of official bodies charged with causing them to be respected."

Professor Pédézet maintained, in a pointed and eloquent discourse, that these positive doctrines were found, first, in the liturgies, and afterwards in the consciences of the people. The pastor Louis Vernes defended the same thesis with great force of argument. He showed that the liturgies of the Reformed Church, and particularly the Apostles' Creed, contained an explicit declaration of the great Christian doctrines; and that the consistories which, according to the decree of March, 1852, were bound to watch over the maintenance of the liturgies, were also obliged in doing so to guard the safety of the Church's doctrines. Nothing could be more logical on condition that the consistories consent to fulfill their vocation; but if they be so constituted as to afford no guarantee of fidelity to these doctrines of the liturgy, how is it possible to avoid the disorders now lamented? There must be, at all costs, a tribunal of appeal—a superior authority. Without synods no real reorganization can be effected. This is what M. Jalabert, formerly professor at Nancy, the most moderate

orator of the Liberal party, demonstrated with great ability in a wise and forcible discourse: "We are not," said he, "in a normal condition. We have not the synod, which would be the crown of our religious edifice. Suppose that the Church were constituted in a complete manner; from a decision of the council of presbyters we might appeal to the consistory; from that to the provincial synod; and from the provincial to the general synod, which gives expression to the conscience of the Church." The intervention of M. Guizot in the debate produced a great sensation. With his commanding eloquence, he supported the following motion, which was carried by a large majority:

"We, the undersigned, pastors and elders of the Reformed Church of France, assembled in conference at Paris, according to established usage, on occasion of the annual public meetings of our different religious societies, deeply grieved and troubled in spirit by the doubts and denials which have for some time been put forward with regard to the fundamental basis of the Christian religion,—

"Consider it an incumbent duty towards God, towards our Lord Jesus Christ and our Church, to state aloud our common strong conviction on this subject.

"The Christian doctrines especially assailed of late are—
1st. The supernatural acting of God in the government of the world, and particularly in the establishment of the Christian religion. 2ndly. The divine and supernatural inspiration of the sacred writings, and their supreme authority in matters of religion. 3dly. The eternal Divinity and the miraculous birth, as also the resurrection, of our Lord Jesus Christ, God-man, Saviour and Redeemer of men.

"At the same time that these fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith are disputed or formally denied, it is maintained that the Reformed Church neither has nor ought to have any positive dogmas, and that every pastor is free to profess within the church itself all his individual opinions.

"We consider these negations altogether destructive, both of the Christian religion and of the Reformed Church. We

have absolute faith in the supernatural acting of God in the government of the world—in the Divine and supernatural inspiration of the sacred writings, as well as in their supreme authority in matters of religion—in the eternal divinity and miraculous birth, as also in the resurrection, of our Lord Jesus Christ, God-man, Saviour and Redeemer of men. We are convinced that these foundations of the Christian religion are also the foundations of the Reformed Church, which has positively recognized them as such throughout its liturgy, and which, in accordance with the universal Church, publicly professes its faith in them as summed up in the Apostles' Creed.

“We hold the great principle of religious liberty as strongly as any one, and we hold it not for ourselves alone, but also for those who differ from us. In virtue of this principle, every one is free to profess his belief, and to unite himself with those who hold the same; but we cannot conceive what kind of Church that would be which should have no common faith, and in which the most different or even contrary opinions might with impunity be professed. Such a state of things would not be the enjoyment of religious liberty, but the destruction of the religious community, which needs, even more than other societies, a deep and earnest sympathy. The Reformed Church of France is an ancient and organized religious society; it possesses vital principles and historical institutions; and even in the prolonged absence of synods it has, in its consistories and its councils of presbyters, legal authorities, the right and the duty of which it is to maintain its principles, and this in virtue of the laws of the State as well as of its own discipline.

“The Reformed Church recognizes the sacred books alone as the rule of its faith, and it has never admitted, and can never admit, that those who dispute the divine and supernatural inspiration of those books, and their supreme authority in matters of religion, are none the less authorized to speak and to teach in its name.

“We have full confidence that, in thus expressing our deep common convictions, we express the sentiments of the great

majority of the members of our Church, while we remain ourselves constant to the faith of our fathers, and to the dignity and stability of the Church which they founded."

"This," said M. Guizot, "is not a confession of faith ; it is simply the declaration of our own belief. We aspire only to a free and moral influence." The illustrious orator then, after explaining that he had not wished to insist especially on the points of doctrine more particularly assailed at present, thus concluded his admirable speech :

"I hasten to the end. I do not wish to prolong beyond measure this discussion, which opens before us subjects so vast and far-reaching. I shall say one word only touching the organization of our Church and the authorities established within it. It is desired that the pastor should be the sole interpreter of the faith ; the Bible and the individual conscience of the pastor—to these the right belongs. Let the pastor explain the Bible as he understands it, and no one can demand more. But this would be the suppression, the abolition of the Reformed Church herself. It is one of the essential characteristics and of the great results of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, that it did not leave religion under the exclusive rule of the ecclesiastical society, but gave to the laity, to all believers, a place and a part in the government of the Church, side by side with the clergy. The authority resides in assemblies in which pastors and laymen sit together to deliberate and to decide. Let us beware of allowing this grand feature of our Church to be changed—faith and liberty would suffer alike.

"I will only, in conclusion, call your attention to one fact, and it is the principal fact of the present crisis. Look around you. The assault on the bases of the Christian faith is being made everywhere—in Germany, in Switzerland, in Holland, in England, in France. People say they are not afraid ; neither am I, provided that the defence answer to the attack—provided that believers remain not inert and indolent in the presence of unbelievers who are ardent and active. I have full confidence in the Christian cause, but men are the instru-

ments of God. It was through the faith and labor of the first Christians that God founded the Christian religion ; it is by the faith and labor of Christians now that that religion should be defended. We have before us a great crisis and a great work—greater indeed than we can appreciate. In the struggle that we are maintaining—in the crisis through which we are passing, we are the vanguard of Christianity : all Christian communions follow behind us. Let us show that we are up to the level of this great work, and firmly resolved on its accomplishment.⁷⁷⁸

We do certainly attach very great importance to this remarkable declaration, and all the more because the statement of principles proposed by M. Guizot was intelligently preferred by the assembly to the vague address of the Synod of 1848, the simple adoption of which was demanded by Professor Jalabert. We must, however, remember that the conference of May, 1864, had no legal character ; that it was not formed of delegates of the Church, and represented only itself. It confined itself, indeed, to indicating the object to be attained ; but the expression of the desires of so numerous an assembly was a moral fact that will have its effect on the future doctrines of the Church. It in no way changes, however, its present condition. It does not replace on its basis the essential dogmas of the Christian faith. It does not modify its actual constitution or remove its patent disorders. Nothing proves this better than what took place at Nîmes, at the pastoral conferences held there on June 1st of the same year. The proportion of rationalistic pastors is known to be much greater in the south of France than in the north. It was the avowed intention of the leaders of the party to make a counter-manifestation, which should be a response to the Paris manifesto. But it was needful to be sure of a majority. This was why they revived an article from the regulations of the conferences of Le Gard, which had long fallen into disuse,

* All these quotations are taken from the pamphlet published in 1864, under this title, "*Les Conférences pastorales de Paris en 1864.*"

by which a voice in the deliberations was refused to all the elders of churches who did not belong to the council of presbyters of Nîmes. This dismissal of the laity from a discussion touching the faith of the Church was, on the part of the champions of liberalism, at once a great scandal and a serious mistake. It certainly avoided the chance of a minority ; but the party that lent itself to such a measure, so opposed to the true spirit of the French Reformation, incurred the just reproach of desiring liberty only for the promotion of doctrinal disorder. It would, indeed, be but too convenient to cover the most audacious negations with a fold of the pastoral robe, refusing to the elders the opportunity of expressing their views, under the pretext that theology belongs only to the clergy. The Evangelical members of the assembly could not consent to this decision. They withdrew in a body, and determined to found a conference of their own. The Liberal party, thus left master of the ground, unfolded its banner in peace. After refusing the evening before to acknowledge the Apostles' Creed as the expression of the universal faith of the Christian Church, it opposed to the manifesto of Paris an address of the same kind as that of the Synod of 1848, lavish in pious phrases, but not involving the admission of any supernatural fact, or of any dogma. All this unction was pure waste, for the world knew well what was meant by these texts so loosely sewn together that every interpretation and every negation might easily pass between them.

The most important fact at the close of this year 1864, so fruitful in agitations, was the inauguration at Alais of the Evangelical Conference of the South, formed after the stormy debates at Nîmes. This manifestation was more important than that of the conferences at Paris in the spring. The incompatibility between the two portions of Reformed Protestantism had become so absolute that they could no longer even deliberate together. The Church was effectually divided. In opposition to the Church of free thought, the Evangelical Church was constituted. The division was, however, of course but for a time, since, as long as the official forms are not aban-

done, the two parties must encounter one another again. But no matter: the schism was morally effected and openly declared. The conference at Alais, by the rules of its constitution, took for its basis a doctrinal rule at once broad and precise, and demanded its ratification by all the members, lay and clerical. The essential article of this rule is thus expressed: "Founded on the double basis of the faith and organization of the Reformed Church, the conference professes, on the one side, a faith in the supernatural as attested in the inspired books of the Old and New Testaments, summed up in the Apostles' Creed, and finding its supreme manifestation in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, very God and very man." Suppose this article to be inscribed on the front of the Reformed Church, instead of being merely the rule of a conference, and you have the Church at once in its normal condition. Assemblies such as those of Alais must contribute effectually to prepare for this future, but do not, any more than those of Paris, supply a remedy for the doctrinal anarchy in the official establishment. This anarchy is rather proved than removed by declarations such as those of Paris and Alais, the very need of which springs from the fact that the old confession of faith and the old discipline are virtually abandoned.

Were there any doctrinal authority in exercise in the Established Church, we should fear to weaken it by such declarations.

We have seen the importance attached by the Evangelical party to the apostles' Creed at the conferences of Nîmes as at those of Alais. It was not that they maintained the apostolic origin of this summary of the faith, which is only a development of the baptismal formula gradually added to during the first three centuries. But it had the advantage of being accepted by all Christian churches, as expressing the facts that constitute the everlasting Gospel, and bringing out in bold relief the idea of the supernatural, which was more and more forsaken by liberal Protestantism. Forming as it does an integral part of public worship, it seems to protect it

against the invasion of the rationalistic naturalism. Not that it can really do much, at any rate in the present phase of the crisis. On two occasions scrupulous persons had been known to give in their resignation for the simple reason that they no longer found in the Creed the expression of their faith. The adherents of the liberal party now read without believing it, under pretence that no one any longer accepts it without special interpretations, and also that the pastor in repeating it is the impersonal voice of the Church. M. Réville has defended this idea in an ingenious article in the "Revue de Théologie." Some of the pastors of this party precede the reading of the Creed by a form of words in which they ask of God to enlighten our faith--thinking in this way to harmonize duty and sincerity. These subtleties are beyond us. We cannot understand how *I believe* should ever signify, *I believe not*. We do not impeach the honesty of the persons who lend themselves to such equivocations, since they avow them aloud; but surely nothing could more clearly prove the confusion of men's minds than these practices. A cry of intolerance was raised because the Consistory of Paris refused the elder M. A. Coquerel two assistants proposed by him, on the ground that they did not distinctly assert their adherence to the Creed. This respectable body could not, however, have acted otherwise. Let the question be asked of any jury of men of upright conscience, strangers to the Church conflicts, and one may safely leave to them the verdicts.

This discussion regarding the assistants, and violent debates raised by the refusal of the council of presbyters to suffer M. Réville to supply the pulpit of the Oratoire for M. Martin Paschaud, occupied the close of this year, 1864. Preparations were being made on both sides for the grand battle of the elections, which would renew by one-half the presiding bodies of the Church. These elections took place throughout France in the month of January, 1865. At Nîmes, at Bordeaux, and at Havre, they were to the advantage of the Liberal party, as also in some smaller churches. The Evangelical party counted numerous triumphs in the departments. Taken

altogether, however, the forces were almost equally balanced, with a slight advantage on the side of the Evangelicals. The ultimate result has not modified the respective positions of the opposing parties. But every one felt that the great stake was at Paris. We have already adverted to the electoral law laid down by the decree of March 26, 1852. We have seen that, in order to be an elector, it is necessary, first, to be thirty years of age before the 31st December of the year in which the name is inscribed; secondly, to have by the same period lived two years in the parish, if a Frenchman, and three, if a foreigner; thirdly, to be subject to no incapacities entailing the loss of the electoral right in politics; fourthly, to prove admission to the holy communion; fifthly, to declare oneself a frequenter of public worship; and sixthly, in case of marriage, to have received the nuptial benediction in the Protestant Church. Conditions touching belief strike us by their absence from these regulations—the fate of the Church is left entirely to the chances of an election. This is the radical defect in the present organization of Reformed Protestantism. The Consistory of Paris added no religious clause to these conditions; it had not indeed any right to do so, but it made certain rules for maintaining, as strictly as possible, this insufficient electoral law. Thus, every one is now obliged to be entered individually in the parochial register before a commission named for the purpose, and a residence of two years is required of proselytes. There is nothing in the additions to contradict the decree, or really to limit its applications. They called forth, notwithstanding, strong remonstrances on the part of the Liberals, who even appealed to the minister and professed to have sufficient grounds on which to reverse the elections.

Nothing can give an idea of the violent excitement of this electoral period. To the journals already existing other small ones were added in profusion. Each party in the Church multiplied its agents in order to assemble its adherents. Every evening the electors collected together in all parts of Paris. The political journals took sides—the democratic ones under-

taking the defence of the Liberal party, but not without leading it into some dangers by an imprudent frankness. *Le Siècle* and *Le Temps* openly asserted that the choice lay between natural and supernatural Christianity. No immediate effect could evidently result from the elections in an ecclesiastical point of view, since, so long as the electoral law lasts, the principle of anarchy will continue also. But not the less was it very important to prove to which side the great Church of Paris inclined. The Liberal party did not shrink from the most extreme measures; it brought men up to the election, honorable men no doubt, but who had made a public profession of atheism or of Pantheism. And yet it was in the minority in the January election, though it is true that it had only thirty-five votes less than its opponents, and that a new election was required for the illustrious statesman who consecrates his green old age to the defence of Christianity. The fight was most vehemently resumed around the name of M. Guizot. The Liberal party did not hesitate to attack his past political life, which had no connection with this religious question, and the Evangelical party was wrong in suffering itself to be led on to this ground. At the election of the 5th of March, M. Guizot triumphed, but with a majority of eleven only, which left the Church of Paris divided into two almost equal portions.

A result such as this was not adapted to extinguish the internal conflicts, and accordingly they continued with redoubled animation, as might be seen at the last conferences at Paris, in the month of April, 1865. The national conferences contented themselves with ratifying, by a second vote, the declaration of principles made the preceding year, in spite of violent protests from the "left." The general conferences were especially instructive, as showing what the Church would become, if once given up to the Liberal party.

A resolution had been brought before the assembly, in the name of the Evangelical party, to this effect: "The assembly recognizes that no Christian Church is possible without an explicit belief in the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

The following was the response presented in the name of the Liberal party, and countersigned by fifty-six pastors or elders :

"On the question raised by the conference, 'regarding the tie that connects Christian evidence and doctrine with the fact of the resurrection of Christ,' the undersigned pastors and laymen, considering that the miracle of the resurrection of Christ has long been regarded as indispensable to confirm his divine mission, and to ensure the immortality of believers ; but that this miracle, such as it is described under different forms in the Gospels, is subject to considerable historical difficulties ; that these difficulties are not unacknowledged by any earnest mind, whatever views it may hold in other respects ; that there are now found in all Protestant churches, and in our own especially, men who have been led by the impartial study of the New Testament narratives, to question or even to deny the reality of the event under consideration, without their faith in their divine Master being thereby shaken or diminished ; that it is impossible, therefore, to attach to a fact, open to so much controversy, the importance which orthodoxy persists in attributing to it ; that indeed the modern religious conscience, instructed in the school of Christ himself, and slowly developed during eighteen centuries of Christian education, has learned, on the one hand, not to make the divinity of the Master's teaching dependent on his corporeal reappearances ; and, on the other, to regard, as independent of that fact, the certainty of eternal life, so that faith should rest for the future, not on the doubtful arguments of critical erudition, inaccessible to the simple believer, but on the evidence of truth itself ;—declare that, divided among themselves on the historical question, they are fully agreed in distinguishing between that question and Christianity itself, and resting the simple and living demonstration of faith on the accordance of the holy words of Christ with the principles and wants of the human soul."

We fancy we are dreaming when we read declarations such as these signed by pastors ! To assert that it matters little

whether or not one believes in the resurrection, which is indeed merely an accessory in Christianity—this is not only to separate oneself wholly from all the past of the Church, but also to shock the common sense of men generally. We can understand how the Gospel may be rejected on the ground of the resurrection; but how any one can pretend to admit the one, while denying the other—this is what confounds the mind.

The document of the fifty-six sufficiently explains the energetic resistance of the evangelical portion of the Church, which could not consent to see the ecclesiastical establishment made, as it were, a bed of rest on which Christianity might die in peace.

We have yet to trace one last episode of this long crisis, which is still far from its close. We refer to the proposition made by the Council of Presbyters at Paris to demand the resignation of the pastor Martin Paschaud, giving him a pension of six thousand francs. The matter is still pending before the Minister of Public Worship. The Council and the Consistory take their position on the following grounds: They first advert to the pastor's prolonged ill-health, causing him out of the twenty-five years of his ministry at Paris to supply but two years of full service. In this condition he has not wished for any other assistant than the one whom the Consistory had prohibited, but for whom he has repeatedly and urgently asked. He is also reproached for the hostility which he has always shown to the majority of the Consistory, opposing its decisions from the pulpit, and choosing the most marked men of the Liberal party for his supplies. Finally, they complain of his doctrinal opinions (though without defining them precisely) as in flagrant opposition to the faith of the Reformed Church. This measure brings us to the violent debates of last year. Protests and counter-protests succeeded one another in the religious journals, and the political press again interposed with passionate articles, some of which were decidedly abusive. To the decision of the Consistory, M. Martin Paschaud and his party opposed in respect of facts

the following assertions: Firstly, If once the accused pastor have resumed his service, and consented in case of absolute incapacity to have his place supplied at the will of the Consistory, the conflict is at an end. Secondly, In a church divided into two almost equal portions, pastors siding with the minority of the Consistory do nothing unseemly in supporting their party. Thirdly, This divided state of the Church ought to hinder the Consistory from taking such extreme measures as amount in fact to a trial on the ground of doctrine. In the matter of principle and of legality, they appeal to the irremovability of pastors. They do not dispute the right of suppression in extreme cases, but such a measure demands very serious grounds, and must follow a well-known legal course. It is quite another thing from a compulsory resignation, not provided for by the law. This last measure breaks up a pastoral career quite as effectually as the former, without being connected with so careful an examination, affording a guarantee for its justice. On this last point, the apology of the Consistory, expressed with much ingenuity in a memorial in which the hand of an illustrious statesman is plainly to be recognized, appears to us but little satisfactory. From the fact that a punishment so extreme as suppression may in certain cases be inflicted, it does not follow that a lighter punishment, not provided for by law, must be also legally justifiable. Thus, the Minister of War may, in specified cases, order the dismissal of an officer, but he cannot pension him off. It seems to us that wise heads may be divided on this question. On the other hand, the Liberal party is singularly hampered by its own previous exploits in respect of dismissal. It is visibly embarrassed when the name of Adolphe Monod is mentioned—especially in an affair connected with M. Martin Paschaud, for no one has forgotten his part in the crisis of the church of Lyons. The Liberal party has a beam in its eye in respect of pastoral irremovability, of which it has made very light on several occasions when it was itself in power. It makes a great distinction between the non-reëlection of the younger M. Coquerel as assistant Minister, and the proposal to pension

off M. Martin Paschaud, since, in the former case, the Consistory acted in its spiritual capacity, without having recourse to the State, while in the latter it is obliged to submit to the civil authority a trial regarding doctrine. We are told that it could not do otherwise, considering the constitution of a Church united to the political power. If synods existed, there would be in the Church itself a tribunal which would judge according to fixed rules established by a wholly spiritual power. In the absence of this ruling body, the State is at once the tribunal that judges, and the power that executes. It is constrained to decide questions of doctrine and of conscience, and this is peculiarly difficult without the existence of a confession of faith or a rule of discipline. The evil is immense, and brings fully into light the defects of the present system, while it singularly complicates the praiseworthy attempt of the Evangelical portion of the Reformed Church to reconstitute the religious community on its true basis. The question of its reorganization has just been debated by the Senate, on occasion of the petition of a pious and zealous layman of the church of Hâvre, M. F. de Conninck, in which he demands the provincial synods which the law of Germinal, An. X., had retained. We do not believe that the re-establishment of this intermediate machinery would be of the slightest use, for the provincial synods would only be consistories somewhat enlarged. That which most deeply offends us, in this deliberation of the Senate, which turned not merely upon the external organization of the Church, but upon doctrines also, is to see these great matters of the soul and the conscience debated in a political assembly. This debate had been truly Byzantine in its character, recalling the time when religious parties, orthodox or Arian, sought each by turns to pull the robe of Constantine, and draw the imperial power to their side. The Senate gave a vote unfavorable to the Evangelical party, and then passed disdainfully to the order of the day. We are almost tempted to congratulate the party on a check which will strengthen its repulsion from the dangerous help of the civil power inter-

fering in religious matters. This state of things makes us believe that the ecclesiastical crisis is approaching its decisive moment; for when both sides have come to demand that the State shall cut a knot so delicate, the blessed day cannot be far off, when the Christian conscience shall decide it at a single stroke, breaking the bond which unfortunately for them now unites the two powers, spiritual and temporal.

Let us sum up what we have been saying, and then conclude. The Ecclesiastical debate borrows all its importance from the doctrinal one, which divides the Protestant Church as a whole into two camps. It is certain that this debate touches the very foundation of religion, and that the question is, which shall triumph—supernatural Christianity, or that which dares to call itself natural. The whole of one portion of the Reformed Church defends the everlasting Gospel with energy, carrying a standard broad enough to cover the different shades of faith, without wishing (if we except some persons of extreme views, far behind the rest) to assail the legitimate freedom of Christian thought. We need not say how fully we are in accordance with this party, or with what sympathetic interest we follow their course in the struggle, in which, moreover, all true Christians of every Church have a part.

The doctrinal discussion could not but connect itself with the Ecclesiastical conflict. Two parties so different could not encounter one another in the same system of forms without clashing. The shock was felt first in the domain of theory, the two ideas of the Church being as distinct one from the other as natural and supernatural Christianity. In the view of the Protestantism which calls itself liberal, the Church has no other basis than that of free inquiry; it is not an association founded on a definite belief, but a school open to instructions of every kind. According to evangelical Protestants, the Church is a religious community founded on an explicit profession of the Christian faith. In the heat of discussion, through the fire of battle, this notion has fixed itself more

and more definitely, as may be seen in the opinions expressed at the conferences of Paris, and, above all, in the constitution of the conference of Alais, which demands a profession of faith on the part of laymen as well as pastors. On this point also we are profoundly in sympathy with the Evangelical portion of the Reformed Church. It will evidently take further steps in this path; for since the presiding bodies no longer recruit themselves, but are supplied by elections, the direction of the Church depends on the religious and moral state of its members. It is not enough, then, to have noble institutions on paper,—a confession of faith written down, and pastors bound to teach in conformity with it; it is needful also that the electors—that is to say, the private Christians—should give pledges to the faith of the Church, which has no other security than an individual profession. It is certain that the whole Evangelical portion of the Reformed Church is advancing in this direction, and this is certainly what it understands by the re-establishment of discipline.

The two parties, completely different in their conceptions of Christian doctrines and in their notions of a Church, seek to have their respective views carried out in ecclesiastical practice. The debate is unfortunately complicated here by an abnormal condition of things, which prevents it from finding its issue. Legally speaking, the Evangelical party has not means sufficient to reconstitute the Church on its true basis. It is, no doubt, armed against certain exaggerations and offences. The liturgy and the ordering of public worship suffice to prevent flagrant negations, or, at least, give the right to condemn them. But we all know that flagrant negations are rare in the Christian pulpit. What there is greatest need to guard against or to repel is the cautious denial of the essential dogmas of Christianity, and these cannot be prevented with no rule of faith and no officially accepted discipline. Now we have shown that nothing of the kind exists at present in the Church. We pay very little heed to archæological researches in this matter. It avails us little to know whether the confession of La Rochelle has been formally ab-

rogated or not. Either way, it is abrogated in fact—no one would think of signing it now; it binds neither pastors nor laymen. The electoral law of 1852 suffices of itself to prove this. The possession of a Church is not claimed, like that of a material property, by exhibiting old parchments. Thus, in the absence of a general and recognized rule, each particular Church governs itself; and the words of Pascal may be here applied—*Orthodoxie au Nord, Hétérodoxie au Midi*. The anarchy is complete. Moreover, the official belief of a Church like that of Paris may vary from one year to another, everything depending on the chances of elections. Such is our present position.

The Liberal party finds this state of things most admirable; it can effect in security, under the protection of the State, the most radical revolutions. This protection is, indeed, the condition of its existence. It refuses synods, therefore; for nothing would give it more ground for alarm than that the Church should govern itself. It is otherwise with the Evangelical party, that aspires to the synodal system, knowing well that the Church through its delegates has alone the right to re-establish the rule of faith which would put an end to the existing anarchy. In the meantime it tries, according both to its right and its duty, to gain the ascendancy in the elections, and to overpower decided rationalism wherever it has a majority. Nothing could be better, so long as it is not obliged to have recourse to the direct intervention of the minister of public worship, which would in the present state of things be infinitely more hurtful than useful, for the reasons which we have indicated.

We desire most earnestly that the synodal system may be tried as a great experiment; but will it remedy all evils? We do not believe that it will, so long as the union with the State shall endure. How, indeed, shall the first truly representative synod be convoked? It would probably be done according to the present electoral law, for the civil power could not impose other conditions without entrenching on the future deliberations of the assembly. The first synod would thus re-

flect the actual disorder of the Church. It would be divided ; how then should it elaborate an adequate rule of faith ? Compromises such as those of the address of 1848 are no longer possible. Nothing would be more fatal than to rest contented with a vague and insipid profession ; yet, if anything else were produced, the synod would be at once divided. It may be asked, might there not possibly be a majority of the orthodox ? Granted. But, even in that case, what should be done with the minority, which would still be a considerable party ? What should the State do with the minority, for it could not refuse to recognize honorable citizens who pay a tax for public worship like the rest ? No one will seriously admit the idea that the Church of free thought might be supported side by side with the Evangelical Church. The State will never enter on a course such as that. It will rather get rid of all exaggerations and imprudences, and seek to attain a vague ground of agreement. Suppose the best—that the evangelical party has triumphed—no one can predict its continued triumph from the events of the present time. Sooner or later there will be trials on the grounds of doctrine. To whom, then, shall those who demanded synods address themselves ? They will appeal to the State, and the evils which they thought to avoid will all recur again. But we are reasoning on a hypothesis that is far from being realized, for in order to the re-establishment of Synods in France there must be such changes in the sphere of government as shall soon necessitate the separation of Church and State. In that direction lies the future, and no other. We only wish it were the present instead. Suppose that the Evangelical party, weary of so many disorders, so many delays, harassed by obstacles always probable in a system of universal suffrage, without religious conditions, should say, “ We have waited long enough ; we can no longer admit of contradictory teachings, amid that overflow of infidelity which is the shame and misery of our age. We need a rule of faith, a Church worthy to call herself Christian, a synod by which she may be represented. Let us conquer on the ground of liberty that which the State will never give. Let us re-con-

stitute the Church of our fathers, which does not appear to have had for its characteristic feature the support and protection of the State. Let us renew the grand tradition of a common faith. Let us take at our own risk that which will never be bestowed, and content ourselves with having Jesus Christ for our Ruler and King." Suppose the Evangelical Reformed Church thus re-established by an act of heroic courage. All is now changed. The useless and irritating agitation of a desperate controversy is abandoned; assiduous efforts to recruit the electors are no longer needed. Effective Christianity is substituted for worldliness and routine religion. We need no longer wait the good pleasure of a minister of State to supply the most urgent and sacred exigencies of the spiritual life. It shall be seen now of what faith is capable when left to itself,—how inexhaustible are its resources. It shall be seen also into what annihilation the rationalistic party will fall when thrown upon its own zeal, and having no object for its ancient bitterness, the intestine war being ended. Here is greatness, power, sacred and all-conquering enthusiasm.

It were needless to ask, if we in England desire this glory for the Reformed Church of France. We wish, for her own honor, that she should resolve of herself to perform this courageous act, without waiting for the social necessities that must sooner or later bring the full liberty of souls. We are not romantic on this subject of free churches; for it is a system that has its difficulties and its dangers, and that calls for persevering labor. During more than two hundred years we have put this principle to the test on this side of the channel. The churches of France are now learning at a rough school, and making a difficult experiment. English Congregationalists recognize with sympathy their sufferings and their imperfections, but there is no other solution for the ecclesiastical question in existing circumstances. Let us not forget, moreover, that the constitution of a free Presbyterian Church, independent of the State, would put an end to many of the troubles and difficulties of the Reformed Church in France, uniting in a new harmony the principles of authority and liberty. This Church

will be eventually formed, we are assured. Everything tends to it—both the progress of light and the accumulation of difficulties. We shall watch every step which leads to its inauguration with the warmest interest ; nor will our friends within or beyond the National establishment be offended by our sympathy with that, which if realized, must be fruitful in Christian life and true spiritual liberty.

ART. V.—THE NAME OF THE LORD.

By REV. J. M. JOHNSON, HANOVER, N. J.

CAREFUL readers of the Bible must be struck with the manner in which the word "Name" is used in reference to God and Christ. It is presented as the object of prayer and praise, and of the affections of love, fear, faith and hope. It is made the reason for divine and human action. Reverence for it is the subject of one of the ten commandments, and one of the seven petitions of the Lord's prayer. It occurs in the Bible nearly three hundred times. Such frequent and significant use of the term must be for some important purpose. The object of the present essay is to aid in the discovery of that purpose by an examination of Scripture usage, in the belief that a study of the subject will give more definite ideas of God and Christ ; more impressive views of the third commandment, and first petition of the Lord's prayer, and show what is the proper devotional use of divine titles ; in a word, that it will reveal a living and abiding charm in the "name of the Lord," whether applied to Jehovah or Jesus.

It must be remembered at the outset, that the word Name signifies far less in modern times and languages than it did in the times and languages of the Bible. Now, names are arbitrary appellations, having neither meaning nor object except to distinguish individuals. Then, they were descriptive of

the characters of those who bore them, or commemorative of some incidents of their birth or history. Some Scripture names were given prophetically, describing future characters or events, e. g., Jedediah, John, Jesus, Jezreel. Sometimes God changed the names of individuals to indicate some change of character or relation, e. g., "Abram" to "Abraham," or "High Father" to "Father of a multitude," "Jacob" to "Israel," or "Supplanter" to "Prince with God." Parents are almost always represented in Scripture history as giving significant names to their children.

With such facts before us, showing how much was made of names as given to men, by both God and men, we cannot but feel that when "name" is applied to God it must mean something more than a personal appellation, it must be intended to awaken and keep alive in the mind some important ideas and peculiar emotions. This the usage of Scripture abundantly confirms.

The first particular mention of the "name" of God is found in the account of the calling of Moses when his mission was stated to him. Moses felt the necessity of being able to give a definite description of him who sent him. Therefore he said, "When I come unto the children of Israel and shall say unto them, the God of your fathers has sent me unto you, and they shall say to me, what is his name, what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I am that I am, and he said, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I am hath sent me unto you. And God said moreover unto Moses, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob hath sent me unto you, this is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations. Moses thus received two divine titles which he was directed to use to confirm the faith of his people; the one descriptive of self-existence, the other of peculiar relations to the patriarchs, and suggestive of gracious manifestations to them. These titles expressed to the people the all-sufficiency of God and their interest in him secured by covenant with their fathers.

Afterward, when the increased cruelties of Pharaoh caused the people to complain, and Moses to despond, God encouraged him thus: "And God spake unto Moses and said unto him, I am Jehovah, and I appeared unto Abraham, and unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah, was I not known to them. And I have also established my covenant with them, . . . and I have remembered my covenant. Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am Jehovah, and I will bring you out, etc., and ye shall know that I am Jehovah your God, I am Jehovah." Thus the name Jehovah was authoritatively announced as furnishing sure ground of hope in the promises of God.

In immediate connection with the giving of the law, God warned Moses against idolatry, and gave directions for his worship, and then adds: "In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee." This giving a locality to the "name" of God, is several times referred to as a matter of great importance. "Unto the place which Jehovah your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek." David, in preparing materials for the temple, sought to build a house to the name of Jehovah. Solomon, in his prayer at the dedication of the temple, pleaded for the fulfillment of the promise, "My name shall be there," and God answered, "I have heard thy prayer, I have hallowed this house to put my name there forever." Hence Jerusalem was afterwards known as "the city which Jehovah had chosen out of all the tribes of Israel to put his name there," and the temple was called "the dwelling-place of thy Name."

Again, believers are described by the exercise of various affections for the name of God. "Let them that love thy name be joyful." "A book of remembrance was written for them that feared the Lord and thought on his name." "To you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise." "They that know thy name will trust in thee."

Again, prayer and praise are described as directed to the name of God. "Quicken us and we will call upon thy name."

"Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved" "They shall call upon my name and I will hear them." "All the earth shall worship thee, they shall sing to thy name." "Sing unto God, sing praises unto his name." "I will bless thy name forever and ever."

Again, The regard of God for his name is given by believers as a reason and plea for his mercy. "He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake." "For thy name's sake pardon mine iniquity." "Help us, O God, for the glory of thy name, and purge away our sins for thy name's sake."

God gives the same reason for the exercise of mercy. "For my name's sake will I defer mine anger." "I wrought for my name's sake that it should not be polluted before the heathen."

The name of God is used for benediction. "The name of the God of Jacob defend thee." It is made the ground of hope. "In the name of the Lord we will set up our banners." All obedience to God is summed up in this, "that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, Jehovah thy God."

From these illustrations it is plain that "the Name of the Lord" is not a mere circumlocution for God himself. In many instances the substitution of the appellative God, for "the name" will make nonsense, e. g., "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord in vain;" and "Hallowed be thy name." How absurd to read, "thou shalt not take God in vain," "Hallowed be God." And in such passages as, "They that know thy name will put their trust in thee," where knowledge of the name is made a reason for trust in the person. The passages are few in which such substitution can be made without weakening their force. What definite ideas ought we then to attach to the phrase "Name of the Lord?"

We find an answer to this question in one of the most remarkable scenes in the life of Moses. He had been interceding for his rebellious people, and received not only assurance of mercy for them, but a particular promise for himself. Thus encouraged, he made a farther request. The more he knew

of God the more he desired to know, and he asked, "Show me thy glory." His petition was granted in these remarkable words: "I will make all my goodness pass before thee and I will proclaim the name of Jehovah before thee." The fulfillment of this promise is thus described: "And the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed Jehovah, Jehovah, Elohim, merciful and gracious, long suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression, and that will by no means clear the guilty." These titles and qualities describe the name, the goodness or excellence, and the glory of God. With new conceptions of the majesty of God, Moses bowed his head towards the earth and worshiped with a deeper devotion than ever before. From this illustration we learn that the word "Name," as applied to God in the Bible, signifies generally his "manifested excellence;" not merely that by which he is designated, but that revelation of his perfections which is conveyed by all the methods in which he has made himself known. The simple articulate sounds employed in any or all the divine titles, do not constitute "the name" of God, except in a very inferior and limited sense; the sum of all the ideas conveyed by those titles constitute "the name." The word and ordinances of God reveal him, but they are not his name; what they reveal of his excellencé is his name.

Bearing this in mind we can understand why so many titles are applied to God in the Bible. Some of them are descriptive of single perfections, e. g., "The Almighty," "The Merciful," "The Holy," "The Just;" and it is remarkable that almost all the abstract qualities of his nature are thus used as personal titles.

Some of them are descriptive of relations to men, e. g., "God of Abraham," "King," "Judge," God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, "Father of the fatherless," "God of the widow." "Father in heaven," etc. And it is also remarkable that most of the relations subsisting among men are used in some way to describe relations between God and men. Let us now apply the idea that the Name of God is his manifested excellence.

1. To places and edifices as the dwelling-place of his Name. The tabernacle, the temple, and Jerusalem were so designated, not because God was there personally present as no where else, nor because he there listened to prayer as no where else, but because he there established his worship, consisting of such services, and involving such instruction and revelations, as made his perfections known, and kept his people acquainted with his excellence.

2. Apply the idea to knowing, loving and fearing "the Name of the Lord," as designating true believers. Surely these terms imply something more than the exercise of such emotions towards any divine title. They must signify such an admiring regard for the manifested excellence of God as flows from an intimate acquaintance with his perfections as revealed by himself.

3. Apply the idea to prayer and praise directed to "the Name of the Lord." Calling upon his name is not simply addressing him by his titles, but is an intelligent exercise of faith, in invoking the perfections and pleading the relations expressed by those titles, as Elijah did when he said, "Jehovah, God of Abraham, Isaac and of Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel." Praising the name of the Lord is not repeating his titles in sacred song, but expressing admiration of his revealed excellence, and holding it up to the admiration of others, e. g., "O Jehovah, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth," i. e., the universal manifestation of the divine perfections in the works of Creation and Providence call for praise.

4. We see how "the Name of the Lord" is ground of confidence and hope, e. g., "The name of Jehovah is a strong tower, the righteous runneth into it and is safe;" i. e., the righteous trust in the known perfections of God and feel secure. "I will wait on thy name," i. e., I will hope in thy perfections.

5. We see how regard for the Name of God is a reason for mercy and judgment. "For his name's sake" means not merely for his own sake, nor for his own glory, but for the sake of

what he has already done ; the previous display of his perfections which would be dishonored or repudiated by a failure to fulfill his promises.

"It shall be to the Lord for a name" is spoken of the happy results of Messiah's reign. "So didst thou lead thy people to make thyself a glorious name," is given as a reason for the miracles of Egypt and the wilderness. In these and similar instances the design of miraculous and merciful interventions was to illustrate the perfections of God to the apprehension of intelligent creatures.

6. We see the force of those passages which describe sin and sinners according to their treatment of the Name of the Lord. "If we have forgotten the name of our God" describes gross sin as consisting in not paying due regard to manifested divine perfections. "Pour out thy wrath upon the kingdoms which have not called upon thy name," shows the guilt of prayerlessness to lie in contempt of the divine perfections, manifested as the reason for human confidence. "The Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." The use of whatever represents divine excellence, without due reverence, is aggravated sin.

We now turn to the use of "the Name," in the New Testament.

1. Christ applies it to God in the same way as it is so frequently applied in the Old Testament: "Father, glorify thy name"—i. e., cause thy perfections to be honored through me; "I have manifested thy name"—i. e., I have made known thy perfections.

2. In the form of baptism, the recipients of the ordinance are consecrated to the Trinity as holding the relations and perfections implied in the titles, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and these relations and perfections are invoked in their behalf.

3. The name of Christ is presented as the object of trust, and the source and means of salvation—e. g., "In his name shall the Gentiles trust;" "To them that believe on his name gave he power to become the sons of God;" "There is none other name given among men whereby we must be saved."

4. Christ bids his disciples use his name as the all-prevailing plea at the throne of grace : " Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do it." Hence calling upon the name of Christ is made the peculiar distinction of believers : " With all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord."

5. The Name of Christ was the subject of apostolic preaching : " And when they believed Philip's preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." Hence the sin of impenitent hearers of the gospel lies in this, " They believe not in the name of the only begotten Son of God."

6. The apostles labored, suffered, and hazarded their lives, for the sake of the Name of Christ : " They departed from the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name ;" " I am ready to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus."

Now, it must be remembered that all the titles applied to Christ in the Bible are descriptive and highly significant—e. g., " Prince of Peace," " Son of David," " Son of God," " Son of Man," " Immanuel," (God with us) " Christ," (anointed one) " Jesus," (Saviour) " Light of the World," Bread of Life," and many others, to the number of nearly one hundred. Surely these were used to convey vivid conceptions of the person, character and relations of the Redeemer. Therefore, all that is signified by these titles, and not one or all of the titles themselves, constitutes his Name. Hence, reference to his Name is not mere reference to him as an individual, but to all that his titles import. To believe in his Name, is to trust in his perfections, works and promises. Not to believe in his Name, is to discredit all that is revealed of him. To call upon his Name, is to invoke the exercise of his power and mediatorial office. To plead his Name, is to urge all that he is and has done as a reason with God. Hence the usual conclusion of prayer, " for Christ's sake," is amazingly significant if used intelligibly. To preach the Name of Christ, is to set forth his character, relations and doings. To suffer and die for his Name, is to give the strongest proof of confidence in, and attachment to, all that is revealed concerning him.

In a few instances the Name of Christ is used as synonymous with authority : e. g., "In my name ye shall cast out devils ;" but they are few.

If the foregoing views are correct, they suggest some important practical lessons :

1. They show the necessity of habitual study of the manifestations of divine excellence. The fervor of our devotional exercises depends upon our conceptions of what God and Christ are and have done. Faith, joy, hope, prayer, praise, conversation, service, will all be weak or strong, faint or fervent, just in proportion to our present impressions of God and Christ. Hence the necessity of constant communion with the perfections of God, through his word, works and ordinances. Hence the impossibility of a vigorous piety without constant intellectual effort. Facts concerning God must not only be stored in the memory, but be kept influential, so as to act upon the affections. To grow in grace, we must grow in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. Hence the necessity of teaching and preaching what constitutes the Name of the Lord. Correct ideas of the manifested excellence of God must be the aim of all religious instruction.

2. We learn what use is to be made of divine titles in devotion. The spirit of the third commandment is violated by the frequent, unmeaning repetition of the titles of God in prayer ; but the evil is to be corrected, not by omitting divine titles, but by using them intelligently. He who attaches the true meaning to Lord, God, Christ, Jesus, etc., will not repeat them carelessly, though he may use them very frequently. When our Lord forbade vain repetitions, he implied that there were repetitions that were not vain. The devotional parts of the Bible show frequent use of the divine titles, but so as to quicken devotion, and give expression to its greatest fervency.

In some of the Psalms the name Jehovah occurs in almost every sentence ; e. g., in the 25th, 27th, 29th, 100th, and other very significant titles are connected with it : "I will love

thee, O Lord, my strength ;" "The Lord is my rock and my fortress, and my deliverer, my God, my strength, in whom I trust," etc. Obviously the Psalmist used such expressions to set God distinctly before him as the object of his faith and delight. The Saviour uses the term Father frequently in his intercessory prayer. These illustrations show that it is natural to fervent piety to repeat often those divine titles which suggest and describe the divine perfections and relations which are the ground of faith and hope. As the loving child fondly repeats the names, father, mother, so will the loving Christian fondly repeat the titles which represent the perfections of his God and Saviour.

3. The inquiry is suggested, Do we, in our private and public devotions, rightly use "the Name of the Lord?" Do we conceive fully of what is meant by, "For thy name's sake," "For Christ's sake?" Do we mean what we say when we use these pleas? Do we use the divine titles so as to adore and trust in "the Name of the Lord?"

ART. VI.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ST. LOUIS.

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America met in the First Presbyterian Church of the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, on Thursday, May 17, 1866, and was opened with a sermon by the Moderator of the last Assembly, Rev. James B. Shaw, D. D., of Rochester, N. Y., on Psalm lvi. 2: *Oh Thou that hearest prayer*. The study of prayer was enforced in an earnest and impressive manner, under the different heads: (1.) God does hear prayer. (2.) While God does hear prayer, yet he oftentimes answers his followers in an unexpected way. (3.) Sometimes the answer comes in an unwelcome way. (4.) Prayer is the same thing now that it was in the earlier days of the church. The subsequent proceedings of the As-

sembly, it may be remarked, partook, to an unusual degree, of this spirit of prayer; one hour before the regular sessions of each day was spent in prayer; and there were frequent meetings of a practical and devout character. The meetings held by the Elders also helped to give a right tone to the Assembly.

The Rev. Samuel M. Hopkins, D. D., of Auburn Theological Seminary, was elected Moderator on the second ballot. Rev. John W. Bailey and Rev. Stephen Bush were chosen temporary clerks. The whole number of ministers and elders in attendance was somewhat over two hundred—not quite so many as last year.

Two subjects engrossed much of the time and thoughts of the Assembly: the Church Erection cause, and the question of Reunion with the other branch of the Presbyterian Church, which held its sessions in the same city, in the Second Presbyterian Church. Due attention was given to all other questions, but these were most prominent.

THE CHURCH ERECTION FUND.

The Report presented the following summary of the doings of the Committee during the past year:

“During the year there have been received twenty applications for aid, amounting to \$7,525, thirteen of which were for loans, amounting to \$6,075, and seven for donations, amounting to \$1,450. Ten of the applications for loans were granted, amounting to \$4,675; three, amounting to \$1,400, were refused; one of these required the loan to be in gold; by the other two it appeared that after obtaining the loan the congregation would not have the amount necessary to complete their building; they were informed as soon as the deficiency should be provided for, their application would be granted. Four of the applications for donations, amounting to \$750, were granted; three, amounting to \$700, were refused; one of these absolutely for reason that the aid required was for the purpose of paying a debt which had been contracted in 1858; one as premature, it appearing from the application that, after obtaining the required donation, the congregation would not have the amount requisite to complete their building. They were informed that as soon as this deficiency should be provided for, their application would be granted. The other application for a donation was refused for the reason that it was not in due form, and the amount (\$300) asked for, exceeded the amount limited by the plan of donations. In one case, after the application for a donation had been granted, the congregation refused to execute the bond and mortgage required by the plan, and have not availed themselves of the grant.

"These applications were from eleven Synods—five from the Synod of Missouri, three from the Synod of Minnesota, two from each of the Synods of New York and New Jersey, Illinois and Wisconsin, and one from each of the Synods of Genesee, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Wabash, Peoria, and Alta California.

"There have been received during the year from forty churches on account of loans, \$5,394 22; from sixty-five churches on account of donations, \$839 07; and from thirteen churches for interest, \$986 58, making a total of \$7,210 87.

"The last General Assembly directed this Board to procure the written opinion of eminent legal counsel as to the powers of the Assembly in respect to the Church Erection Fund, especially in reference to the question, whether having received this fund "as a special trust," and in 1854 committed the custody thereof to a Board of Trustees, incorporated by a special statute of the State of New York, the Assembly have the power so to alter the Church Erection Plan, as to make an absolute gift of the increase of the fund beyond the sum of \$100,000, for the purpose named in the first article of the plan. The Board were directed to report such opinions to this Assembly, with the addition of any recommendations which they might deem expedient.

"In compliance with this direction of the Assembly, the Board have obtained, from three eminent counsel, written opinions, which are herewith submitted. None of the gentlemen had any knowledge of the opinions of the others; in fact, neither was aware that any other opinion excepting his own had been, or would be, obtained. It would be seen that they differ in their views of the power of the Assembly over the fund, all agreeing, however, in this: That the fund can never be used excepting for the objects set forth in the first article of the plan.

"By the first opinion, in the order in which they are presented to the Assembly, that of the Hon. Wm. Strong, of Philadelphia, a Judge of the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, it is insisted:

"1st. That the General Assembly has power to direct donations of that portion of the fund which may be in excess of the sum of \$100,000, for the purpose described in the first article of the plan; but that they have no power to make, or direct the Board of Trustees to make, donations of any portion of it.

"2d. That the Assembly has no power to make or direct any *absolute* gift of even the increase or excess above \$100,000, if by *absolute* gift is understood gift without requiring security upon the church property for the return of the money with interest, in case of a change in ecclesiastical relations of the church aided.

"3d. That no alterations of the plan can be made which will authorize donations without requiring such security.

"4th. That the plan may be so altered as to dispense with any requisition of security that an annual collection in behalf of the fund shall be taken up in the churches to which a donation is made, but the church will still be under obligation to take up such a collection, independent of any such security being given.

"By the second opinion, that of Daniel Lord, Esq., of the city of New York, it is insisted:

"That the General Assembly, by the requisite vote, may direct the whole of the fund at any time existing to be applied in donations; that while there is no discrimination to be made between the increase or accumulation of the fund, as to the application of it, or the retaining of it,

yet that it is in the power of the General Assembly, by the requisite vote, to apply the fund to the designated objects without limiting it to the advances which must be returned.

"By the third opinion, that of Marshall S. Bidwell, Esq., of the city of New York, it is, on the contrary, insisted :

"1st. That the amount raised for this fund was received by the Assembly in trust as a permanent fund ; that it must be preserved inviolate ; that it cannot be diminished or impaired ; that the General Assembly, therefore, cannot directly or indirectly give away or dispose of the fund, nor any part of it ; that this restriction is fundamental and irrevocable, and that it is anterior to, and independent of, the plan.

"2d. That the fund cannot be used excepting for the object named in the first article of the plan, the aiding of feeble congregations in erecting houses of worship ; that this restriction is also fundamental and irrevocable ; that while it is recognized in, yet it does not derive its force from, the plan.

"3d. That the law imposes upon every person or body holding the fund in trust, the obligation to keep the fund invested in proper securities, which, in the State of New York, embrace only Government stocks and mortgages upon unencumbered real estate ; that the General Assembly cannot absolve the trustees of this obligation.

"4th. That, subject to the above restrictions, the General Assembly by the requisite vote, may make any changes in the plan, and thus alter the manner of administering it.

"5th. That the permanent fund is not confined to the sum of \$100,000, but embraces all increase of it above that amount, whether by donations, bequests or by unemployed interest, and that such increase is subject to all the conditions of the original fund.

"6th. That it was the duty of the trustees of the fund, in the absence of any specific directions thereto, to add to the fund all the accumulations of interest from time to time, as received, and that if such accumulated interest has been added by the trustees to the fund, it has become an integral part of it, and is subject to the same exemption from change or diminution as appertains to the other parts of the fund ; that it is one fund, a unit ; not two or more funds—a permanent fund, which cannot be impaired by revocation, donation or otherwise, and which it is the duty of the trustees to preserve inviolate.

"The Board have carefully considered these diverse opinions, and will only add that they trust the time will never come when, for the purpose of judicially settling the powers of the General Assembly over the fund, a resort shall be had to law, the proverbial uncertainty of which has received a new illustration in the opinions herewith submitted to the Assembly.

"It is certain that the donors of the fund intended to inaugurate just such a scheme of benevolence as this, and thus far in its management the Board have not in any particular violated any of the principles contended for in these opinions ; and it certainly will be safe to continue to administer the fund substantially upon the same principles which have heretofore obtained, enlarging or diminishing the amount of loans and donations, and their terms, as the exigencies of the congregations to be aided from time to time may require."

The Committee submitted to the Assembly certain amendments to the plan, allowing loans to be made to the extent of

\$750, and donations to the amount of \$300 ; both to be secured by bond and mortgage. They also reported that an appeal to the churches for a supplemental fund had only resulted in a debt for expenses above receipts to the amount of \$68 11.

The condition of the Fund, May 1st, 1866, was this :

Amount of loans to churches, secured by bonds and mortgages.....	\$ 32,046 70
Amount of donations to churches, secured by bonds and mortgages.....	15,013 18
Amount of call loans and temporary investments.....	77,425 45
Interest earned thereon to date.....	1,072 02
Cash in bank.....	1,942 17
Total.....	\$127,499 52

By the Report of the treasurer it further appeared that during the past year, the loans to churches were only \$2,775, the donations to churches only \$400; while the expenses of administering the fund were \$1,845 ; the installments received from churches on account of their bonds and mortgages, and interest on the same, and on account of donations were \$7,219, or about three times the amount loaned. This exhibit made it apparent, that though the Fund has undoubtedly been administered with fidelity, and in conformity with a strict construction of the plan, yet it is not doing its proper work. The receipts in call loans and temporary investments, with interest, amounted to over \$200,000. Some change was imperatively required. The churches do not like to use the fund as it has been administered ; they can get better terms elsewhere. Other denominations are outstripping us, because they pursue a more liberal policy in this matter. The whole subject was carefully reviewed by the Standing Committee on Church Erection, of which Dr. T. M. Humphrey, of Chicago, was Chairman, and, after full deliberation and discussion, they brought in a report and recommendations, which were finally adopted by the Assembly by a very large vote. The chief points in their report are the following :

“ By the twelfth annual report of the Trustees of the Assembly's Church Erection Fund, it is painfully apparent that this fund is but imperfectly

accomplishing its original design. The amount of the fund in 1856 was 100,000 dollars. Now, after ten years' use, it has increased to over \$127,000, \$80,000 of which, at least, remain in the hands of the Board, subject to the call of the churches. Year by year the applications for aid become fewer. But \$2,755 were taken from the treasury last year, in the form of loans, and but \$400 in the form of donations. Meanwhile the receipts from the churches, on account of loans, donations and interest, have been over \$7,000, which added to the interest accruing on the fund itself—nearly \$5,000—constitute an actual increase of the unemployed fund, after deducting expenses, etc., of about \$7,000.

"There is an imperative call for a modification of the plan of administering our Church Erection Fund, and this call becomes the more imperative when we consider that the rapid extension of the lines of traffic has made cities of villages, and villages of hamlets.

"Your Committee believe that could the whole fund be immediately scattered among our feeble churches, in the form of donations, without interest or return of any kind, while the churches aided should remain in our connection, the effect would be most happy. This we believe to be desired by many on the floor of this Assembly. Were such a course possible, we should favor it. But a careful examination of the whole case, has brought your Committee to the stubborn conclusion, so often reached by others who have surveyed the same ground, that such a disposition of the fund was rendered impossible by the very terms on which it was collected. It was to be a *permanent* fund. To destroy its permanency would be a breach of trust which might and which ought to be legally resisted. The legal opinions submitted to the Assembly by the Board of Trustees, place this position upon reasonable dispute.

"The question, therefore, is, how the mode of administering the fund shall be so changed as to make it most useful to the churches. After mature deliberations, your Committee recommend the abandonment of the system of loans, and the adoption of that of donations upon the following plan, viz:

"1. That the whole of the fund now in the hands of the Board, together with such receipts as may return in fulfillment of pledges from the churches already aided by loans and donations, and together with whatever may be hereafter contributed to the fund, be securely and permanently invested.

"2. That the accruing interest be annually distributed by the Board on proper conditions and in proper proportions, to churches applying therefor, in the form of donations without interest and without pledge of return, except in case the church or congregation thus assisted shall cease to be connected with the General Assembly, or their corporate existence shall cease, or their house of worship be alienated, except for the building or purchase of a better house of worship.

"Your Committee cannot but regard it as a providential indication of the wisdom of these proposed changes that they have been suggested to several different minds without concert, and that they have been regarded with favor before this by those high in position in our Church, as will be seen by reference to the report of the special Committee to whom this whole subject was referred by the Assembly of 1863.

"Your Committee would also recommend to the Assembly to consider the expediency of appointing a General Secretary of the Board, whose duty it shall be to discharge the functions in this Board which are discharged in the Committee of Home Missions by its Secretary."

The Committee, in submitting their report, presented also an amended copy of the plan, and proposed various changes, to conform the plan to the arrangement recommended in their reports.

The adoption of these recommendations by the Assembly gives, in some respects, a new character to the fund. The amount now reported, under the head of "call loans and temporary investments," will be invested as a permanent fund; the same course will be taken with what is hereafter received for the loans or in return of donations. The interest of this fund will be given to the churches, and go to pay the expenses of the Committee. The chief condition of the donations will be, that the church buildings shall not be alienated from the Assembly; and it is also held that the churches aided are morally bound to return the amounts given, by collections, as fast as they become able to do so. A General Secretary will also be appointed to solicit funds for this, as for our other ecclesiastical objects. It is thought that at least \$35,000 will be needed for the coming year. It is also expected that the expenses of managing the fund may be materially reduced.

This action of the Assembly, it is believed, will take a stumbling-block out of the way of our progress. As fast as our Home Missionary Committee organize churches, our Church Erection Committee ought to put them in the way of erecting a house of worship. The success of the labor of the former Committee is ultimately dependent upon the efficiency of the latter.

HOME MISSIONS.

The Report of the Committee on Home Missions, by the Secretary, Dr. Kendall, is an able document, that ought to command general attention. It discusses the rapid increase of population at the West; the laws which regulate its movements, making particular mention of the rapid extension of railroads at the West; the Pacific Road, and the vast mineral regions of the West, and the great influx of foreigners into the country. Prairie, forest and minerals attract the people, and where railroads are built, there people go.

The tendency to the centralization of population was also noticed. Never did the great cities of the world grow so rapidly as now. Great centres opened at the West, that for a brief time must have missionary aid; and this depletes and drains the East, and makes a demand for aid to the feeble and decaying churches there.

An encouraging view of religious progress and reconstruction in East Tennessee and Missouri was given. About forty missionaries have been employed in these two States, who have labored on the whole with encouragement and success.

Elsewhere at the South but little has been done. But some efforts among the *Freedmen* have succeeded well.

The obstacles to the work were said to be as follows:

1. *The Lack of Ministers.*—The ministers are too few to meet the demands of the people. More men could be located in one month than all the theological seminaries have turned out in a year. There is no limit to the work if the ministers were plenty.

2. *Lack of Church Edifices.*—The report insists that the Church is not awake to the importance of this matter, and it shows how much the Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, Unitarians, and Episcopalians are doing in the case, and urges the Assembly to devise some method to build churches, especially for all the feeble but promising congregations at the West.

3. *Lack of Funds.*—The Treasurer's report shows that less than \$92,000 have been contributed, but \$106,000 expended during the year. Such a state of things cannot last. The report shows that the Church is able to contribute much more, and calls on the ministers and people to redouble their energies to meet the demand. Only about eight hundred churches of a total of one thousand five hundred in the body had contributed anything during the year.

The whole working force in the missionary field has been three hundred and eighty-five men; fifty-eight more than last year. Six of these have died.

The statistics of the year are encouraging. About fifty churches have been formed, three thousand five hundred souls converted; three thousand and two hundred and forty have united with the churches.

The Assembly was deeply interested in this subject, whose claims are so urgent and growing. It was resolved to raise \$120,000 during the coming year; and this amount is the least that should be thought of.

The Standing Committee on Home Missions, Dr. Knox Chairman, presented an elaborate report on the subject, emphasizing the need of a great increase in the ministry, and in can-

didates for the ministry; the necessity of providing places of worship with greater liberality; and the duty of a higher standard of giving. Some of our encouragements in doing this work were thus set forth:

"There is no department of effort into which we have entered with any vigor, upon which God has not shed his approving and inspiring favor. Witness to this blessing attending our special effort in behalf of East Tennessee, in a discouraged and distracted church reinvigorated, dispersed congregations regathered, in pastors settled over long vacant parishes, and the revival of religion experienced in unprecedented power. Witness the story told by delegates from all parts of the land, of the descending and quickening Spirit. Even the labors employed on behalf of our foreign population, usually regarded as far from hopeful of access, have not been without significant results. The Presbytery of Newark, after a sixteen years' experiment among the Germans, have now as its fruits six churches organized on a Presbyterian basis, all but one provided with houses of worship, with settled pastors, good congregations, a vigorous prospective growth, and an healthful, positive influence going out upon the surrounding population in behalf of Sabbath observance, temperance, social order, and every moral and spiritual interest. The example thus set us by Newark Presbytery, and already emulated by Philadelphia and Cincinnati, should rebuke the prevailing skepticism on this subject. There is a grave responsibility laid upon us here, and we may not shrink from it. Let us remember that while the Irish immigration is fed by a home supply of six and a half millions, the German springs from a fountain of forty millions. Not to care for this industrious, enterprising and acceptable people, is to take very poor care of our own interests."

THE PUBLICATION COMMITTEE.

The report was presented by the Secretary, Rev. John W. Dulles, and shows a gratifying progress; the receipts from all sources were over \$50,000. The subject of colportage was also enforced. The *Presbyterian Monthly*, which has been begun under good auspices, was recommended to the attention of the churches. It represents all of our Permanent Committees. Among the works issued the past year, Dr. Brainerd's admirable memoir of John Brainerd, the Social Hymn and Tune Book, which is not printed fast enough for its demand, Bower's Daily Meditation, and Knox's Love to the End, are particularly worthy of a wide circulation.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions, Dr. Walter Clarke Chairman, spoke in decided terms of our

altogether satisfactory relations with the A. B. C. F. M. The number of our missionaries has been reduced one sixth in three years ; in 1863 we had 56, now, only 47. The amount of our contributions were greater than the previous year : \$112,000, including legacies, \$140,000.

EDUCATION FOR THE MINISTRY.

The number of students in Union Theological Seminary was 130, graduates 32 ; in Auburn, 40 students, 12 graduates ; in Lane, 24 students, 4 graduates. The number of students aided last year was 135 ; 62 in theological seminaries, 60 in colleges, 13 in academies. The receipts of the year were \$18,700 ; balance on hand at the beginning of the year, \$1,750 ; at the close of the year, \$900. A large increase in the number of candidates for the ministry is the most pressing need of our church.

MINISTERIAL RELIEF.

The report of Dr. Butler on this subject shows decided progress. Six thousand three hundred dollars was the sum contributed this year against \$3,600 given the previous year. Mr. Wm. Knowles has donated \$3,400 to the Committee, which is not immediately available. One hundred and thirty persons were helped last year, against forty-four helped the year before. The Committee had been able to give a prompt and cordial response to all applications properly brought before them. The number yet to be heard from was, of course, great, and the Church needs to be fully aroused on the subject. The report stated several very interesting cases which had come within the sphere of the Committee's usefulness, showing how greatly this benevolence had been needed. The balance in the treasury was \$1,605.

SABBATH SCHOOLS.

A Permanent Committee on Sabbath-schools was organized by the Assembly, consisting of the following persons : James B. Shaw, D. D., Grosvenor W. Heacock, D. D., Charles Hawley, D. D., William E. Knox, D. D., Samuel M. Campbell, D.

D., Rev. Charles P. Bush, Rev. William A. Niles, Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, Rev. Charles E. Knox, Ralph Wells, E. F. Huntington, Geo. W. Parsons, Josiah P. Bailey, Truman P. Handy, Samuel Field. The object of the Committee is thus set forth in the report of Rev. Henry Fowler :

1. To supervise the Sabbath-school literature of the Church, in co-operation with the Permanent Committee on Publication.
2. To issue circulars which may help the cause, and use other appropriate methods of the press.
3. To collect data, and from facts to work out practical theses, which may assist pastor's, superintendents, and teachers in the Sabbath-school work.
4. To promote the establishment of Sabbath-schools in localities needing them, within the bounds of the Assembly, among the freedmen of the South, and the Germans of the West, in co-operation with the Permanent Committee on Home Missions.
5. To promote the Sabbath-school cause in heathen lands in co-operation with the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.
6. To promote the establishment of Sabbath-schools in Mexico, Central America, France, Italy and Germany, in co-operation with the American and Foreign Christian Union.
7. To promote the increase of the ministry through influences brought to bear upon the Sabbath-schools, and thus prove an auxiliary of the Education Committee.

The subject of *Manses and Pastoral Libraries* was presented by Dr. Butler, and Mr. Joseph M. Wilson, and the following resolutions were adopted :

1. Resolved, That this General Assembly direct its Presbyteries to send to the churches under their care, a pastoral letter of inquiry, and suggestions with reference to the provision of a manse and a library for the use of the minister in charge of each congregation.
2. That the Presbyteries be requested to embody in a report to the next General Assembly any information that may be obtained in the answers to the proposed inquiry, with their judgment concerning the creation of a manse fund, and also any practical suggestion appertaining to the subject matter of manses and ministerial libraries.

Mr. Wilson's valuable Presbyterian Historical Almanac was also commended to their liberal support.

THE STATE OF THE COUNTRY.

A Committee to present a Report on the State of the Country was appointed, consisting of Rev. N. S. S. Beman, D. D., Henry B. Smith, D. D., William Hogarth, D. D., Rev. Thomas Brown, of East Tennessee, Rev. Henry Fowler, and Judges

Allison and Williams, Hon. J. A. Foote, F. V. Chamberlain and R. Scarritt. Their report, read by Dr. Smith, and adopted by the Assembly with great unanimity, was as follows :

" This Assembly records its devout gratitude to Almighty God, that he has delivered us from the calamities and horrors of civil war, and restored peace throughout our borders.

That he has so far quelled the spirit of secession that the supreme and rightful authority of our beneficent National Government is now restored in all our States and Territories, and we remain, as we were intended to be, one Nation, with one Constitution, and one destiny ;

" That he has so overruled the progress and results of this unparalleled conflict as to make it manifest that our republican institutions are as well fitted to bear the stress and shock of war, as to give prosperity and increase in times of peace ;

" That, by his wise and constraining Providence, guiding us in ways we knew not, he has caused the passions and wrath of man to enure to the welfare of humanity, so that a whole race has been emancipated from an unjust and cruel system of bondage, and advanced to the rights and dignity of freemen ; so that now involuntary servitude, except for crime, is illegal and unconstitutional wherever our national authority extends ;

" That he gave to our people such a spontaneous, impassioned, and unbought loyalty—a loyalty that can neither be forced nor feigned—such resolute and abiding faith, and such a supreme consciousness of our national unity, that we were able in the darkest hours to bear with cheerful patriotism our heavy burdens and our costly sacrifices, so that our very sacrifices have knit us more closely together and made us love our country more ;

" That he has purged and enlightened our national conscience in respect to our national sins, especially the sin of slavery ; and has also made us recognize more fully than before the reality of Divine Providence, the sureness and justice of retribution for national guilt, and the grand fact that a nation can be exalted and safe only as it yields obedience to His righteous laws ;

" That he bestowed such grace upon our churches and ministry, that with singular unanimity and zeal they upheld our rightful Government by their unwavering testimony and effectual supplications, identifying the success of the nation with the welfare of the church ;

" That, above all these things, he has, according to his gracious promise, watched over his church and kept it safe during these troublous times ; so that not only has our American Christianity been vindicated, our faith and order maintained intact, and our Christian benevolence enhanced, but our purposes and plans for the future have been also enlarged in some proportion to the need and growth of our country ; while to crown all these favors with his special benediction, he has also, in these latter days, rained down spiritual blessings in abundant measure upon so many churches all over the land.

" This Assembly, while humbly recognizing these judgments and mercies in the past and the present, also bears testimony in respect to our urgent needs and duties as a nation, in view of the new era upon which we are now entering, as follows, viz :

" 1. Our most solemn national trust concerns that patient race, so long held in unrighteous bondage. Only as we are just to them can we live

in peace and safety. Freed by the national arms, they must be protected in all their civil rights by the national power. And as promoting this end, which far transcends any mere political or party object, we rejoice that the active functions of the Freedmen's Bureau are still continued, and especially that the Civil Rights Bill has become the law of the land. In respect to the concession of the right of suffrage to the colored race, this Assembly adheres to the resolution passed by our Assembly of 1865, (Minutes, p. 42): 'That the colored man should in this country enjoy the right of suffrage, in connection with all other men, is but a simple dictate of justice. The Assembly cannot perceive any good reason why he should be deprived of this right on the ground of his color or his race.' Even if suffrage may not be universal, let it at least be impartial.

"2. In case such impartial suffrage is not conceded, that we may still reap the legitimate fruits of our national victory over secession and slavery, and that treason and rebellion may not enure to the direct political advantage of the guilty, we judge it to be a simple act of justice, that the constitutional basis of representation in Congress should be so far altered as to meet the exigencies growing out of the abolition of slavery; and we likewise hold it to be the solemn duty of our National Executive and Congress to adopt only such methods of reconstruction as shall effectually protect all loyal persons in the States lately in revolt.

"3. As loyalty is the highest civic virtue, and treason the highest civil crime, so it is necessary, for the due vindication and satisfaction of national justice, that the chief fomenters and representatives of the rebellion should, by due course and process of law, be visited with condign punishment.

"4. The Christian religion being the underlying source of all our power, prosperity, freedom and national unity, we earnestly exhort all our ministers and churches to constant and earnest prayer for the President of the United States and his constitutional counsellors; for the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled; for the Judges in our National Courts; for those that bear rule in our Army and Navy, and for all persons entrusted with authority; that they may be endowed with heavenly wisdom, and rule in the fear of the Lord, and so administer their high trusts, without self-seeking or partiality, that this great Republic, being delivered from its enemies, may renew its youth, and put forth all its strength in the ways of truth and righteousness, for the good of our own land and the welfare of mankind.

"5. And we further exhort and admonish the members of our churches to diligent and personal efforts for the safety and prosperity of the Nation, to set aside all partisan and sectional aims and low ambitions, and to do their full duty as Christian freemen; to the end that our Christian and Protestant civilization may maintain its legitimate ascendancy, and that we become not the prey of any form of infidelity, or subject to any foreign priestly domination; that the sacred interests of civil and religious freedom, of human rights and justice to all, of national loyalty and national unity, may be enlarged and perpetuated, making our Christian Commonwealth a praise among the nations of the earth, exemplifying and speeding the progress of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ."

JUDGE STRONG'S REPORT ON PASSING JUDGMENT ON ABSENTEES.

One of the ablest documents presented to the Assembly was a Report made by a Committee appointed last year, con-

sisting of Drs. Fisher and Brainerd, and Judges Strong and Allison, on the following overture :

" When the Judiciary have proceeded, in accordance with chapter IV., section 13, of the Book of Discipline, to take the testimony in the case of an accused person, may they proceed to *pass judgment* thereon as if he were present, or shall he be left simply under censure for contumacy ? "

The Report was read, and ably advocated by Judge Allison ; it was drawn up by Judge Strong. Some of the points made were these :

" The question thus presented is exclusively one of power. It is not whether, in all cases, it is advisable that a Church judiciary should proceed to a final determination of the case, nor is it what has been the usage in some of the tribunals of the Church, but it is strictly, what does the Book of Discipline authorize ? It is freely admitted that a long course of usage under a statute is no inconsiderable evidence of the meaning of the statute, but it must be a usage growing out of the enactment itself, and claimed to have been authorized by it. Mere neglect to exercise powers conferred is no proof that they were not granted.

" Contumacious disobedience of citations is a distinct offense, punishment for which is entirely collateral to discipline for the cause that induced the commencement of the process. It is contempt of the lawful authority of the Church, and suspension for it is summary punishment for the collateral offense alone. Neither directly nor indirectly is it an expression of opinion respecting the delinquent's guilt or innocence of the charge preferred originally against him. * Suspension for contumacy would be proper, without regard to anything beyond it. It is quite conceivable that an accused person may willfully disobey citations, and yet be innocent of the charges made against him. It certainly would be an anomaly in any judicial proceeding to hold that a penalty inflicted for a collateral offence vindicates the law against another and possibly much greater crime.

" If, therefore, the defined ends of discipline are to be secured, a Church session must have power to proceed to trial and judgment, though the accused person refuse to obey the citations duly served upon him, and it is not to be concluded without clear evidence that means given to secure those ends are inadequate. When the meaning of the language used in the fourth chapter is sought, the best guide to it will be found in the paramount intention the language was designed to subserve. The directions given must be construed consistently, with that intention, to further, rather than to defeat it. Looking then to the sections of the fourth chapter, and regarding them as part of a system designed for the purposes above mentioned, to be interpreted so as to harmonize with those purposes as well as with each other, the conclusion seems inevitable that whenever an accusation has been made against a church member, and a Church judicatory has entered judicially upon its consideration, and obtained jurisdiction by service or citations upon him, it may go on to final judgment, though he refused to obey the citations.

"Taking all the sections into consideration, and regarding them as parts of one system, as having reference to the same subject matter, and designed to secure the ends avowed, the Committee are constrained to regard them as applicable to the course of proceeding through all the stages of trial, alike in cases where the accused does not appear in obedience to the citations as when he does. In both the judicatory is empowered to proceed to trial and to final judgment.

"To this conclusion an objection has sometimes been urged that, at first mention, seems to have some plausibility. It is, that trial of a person in his absence, and the rendition of judgment against him, are in conflict with common right and justice; that even criminal courts in State governments do not try offenders in their absence, and that ecclesiastical courts ought to avoid *ex parte* proceedings. The objection aims less at the power of a judicatory, as recognized by the Book of Discipline, than it does at the policy of exercising it. But it misapprehends what are acknowledged common right and justice, what are the proceedings of courts of law and equity in analogous cases, and what are *ex parte* proceedings. Nowhere is it held that a man may not deny himself his plainest rights. While he may not be tried for an alleged offence without having an opportunity to be heard, he has no just cause to complain of a trial to which he has been summoned by a tribunal having jurisdiction, and which he has persistently refused to attend. In such a case, it is he who has thrown away his own right. They are not taken from him. This is a principle universally recognized in courts of civil law and of equity, and such courts go further: they construe a refusal to obey process requiring an appearance as a substantial confession of the complaint, and they render judgment accordingly. It is true State courts, having criminal jurisdiction, do not try persons for crimes and misdemeanors in their absence. This is for two reasons. They have power to compel attendance, which ecclesiastical courts have not, and the punishments they inflict affect the life, the liberty, or the property of the convicted criminal. In fact, they concern the life or the liberty of the accused, for even if the penalty be only a fine, its payment is usually enforced by detention in custody until satisfaction be made. But ecclesiastical tribunals can pronounce no judgment that touches either the life, the liberty or the property of the accused. Their sentences are peculiar. Indeed, it is asserting a false analogy to assimilate a trial before a Church session to an indictment and trial in a criminal court. It bears a much stronger resemblance to proceedings very common in courts of law, in which members of associations or corporations are called upon to respond for some alleged breach of corporate duty, for which they are liable to be punished by the imposition of penalties, or by a motion from membership. In such cases, when the person summoned refuses to obey the mandate of the writ, courts proceed at once to dispose of his case and render final judgment. No one ever supposed that by so doing injustice was done, or that any right of the accused was invaded. Much less can he complain who has been cited to answer an accusation taken into judicial cognizance by a Church judicatory, and who has contumaciously refused to obey the citation, if the tribunal proceed to try the case, presuming nothing against him but contumacy from his refusal, but founding its judgment solely upon the testimony of witnesses. This objection, therefore, when examined, seems to be without substance.

"In conclusion, it remains only to recommend, as the opinion of the

Committee, that the overture be answered by a declaration of the Assembly, that, in the case proposed, the judicatory may proceed to trial and final judgment, as if the accused were present."

The Assembly accepted and adopted this Report.

THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

A letter was received from Sir Henry Wellwood Moncrieff, Bart., D. D., Principal Clerk of the Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, and communicated to the Assembly by Dr. Hatfield. A Committee was appointed to prepare a reply, consisting of Rev. Henry B. Smith, D. D., Edwin F. Hatfield, D. D., and Judge Allison.

The letter was seconded by an address from the Rev. James McCosh, D. D., LL. D., the well-known metaphysical writer, who came with testimonials from leading representatives of the Free Church, and was most cordially welcomed by both Assemblies. His sermons and various speeches gave new interest to the meetings of both Assemblies. In his address to our Assembly he said, in substance, that he did not come officially as a delegate from any church; but, wearied with his writings and his classes, having visited repeatedly the Continent, and not feeling inclined there again, he felt a longing to spend his vacation in visiting some new country, that he might have a glimpse of the future that is before the world. He had taken part with this great nation in its great struggle. In his little field of influence, both as an author and speaker, he had declared his attachment to the cause, and had never for a moment doubted of our success. He was anxious to see the country engaged in the great work of reconstruction. Such were the motives which induced him to come to this country; but when it became known among his friends that he was about to proceed to the United States, he received communication after communication, asking that he might accomplish another end. The Evangelical Alliance had a meeting for the special purpose, and enjoined upon him to say to American Christians how much it was desired, on account of that Alliance, that the American and British churches should be

brought into a more thorough understanding and unity. His friends forwarded to him the letter which had been read by the Stated Clerk. He had been received by the two bodies that have met in this place in a way altogether disproportionate to his position as an individual, but nevertheless he accepted it all because he knew it proceeded from genuine and loving hearts, and because he regarded it as a declaration of respectful feeling towards the British churches. He would take care to repeat this to the British churches, and he knew the general body of them will receive it with joy. He declared that America and Great Britain was bound together by strong bands—were one in race, one in liberty, and one in the love of education, and especially, and above all, one in believing in one God and one Saviour; that the Presbyterians in both countries were one in faith, discipline and polity generally. He referred to the troubles of the Church of Scotland, and to some facts of his own history, illustrating what the churches of Great Britain had had to contend with, and passed to the present condition of the churches. The Free Church of Scotland, though not a numerous body, had contributed for the year ending May 1st, 1865, the sum of £350,000 for the support of the Gospel; had set going a general sustentation fund for poor congregations, a benevolence institution by Dr. Chalmers, which had been carried on with great vigor and liberality, and to which the Church contributed in 1865, £180,000, and in twenty-two years ending May, 1865, the total sum of £6,000,000. The Free Church of Scotland has been instrumental in bringing about a state of things that looked to the union of all the churches of like faith and government, not only in the United Kingdom, but in the Colonies, and the speaker took the opportunity to say that the British churches were most anxious to be in some way officially connected with the Presbyterian bodies in this country, by having delegates reciprocally accredited to the General Assemblies, who might have a voice and a vote on the more important questions of general interest to the Church.

The letter received from the Free Church of Scotland is as follows :

To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, N. S.

"DEAR CHRISTIAN BRETHREN :—We take advantage of the meeting of our General Assembly, at present convened, to greet you cordially in the name of the Lord. We feel constrained to do so in consequence of the singularly momentous character of recent events in your country, and of their mighty influence on your respective churches. It may be premature to say much, as the echoes of war have scarce yet died away, and the future may be, in other ways, as eventful as these four years of conflict; but without anticipating Providence, we have a plain Christian duty to discharge, in consequence of what falls already within the province of history.

"God has assuredly been speaking to your country by terrible things in righteousness. The plowshare of war has gone deep into the soul of your people. You have been long familiar with scenes of bloodshed, such as the world never saw before, and we pray God, if consistent with his holy will, it may never witness again. But, even in this respect, good has come out of evil; for the agony and ruin of war have opened up to you many new fields of Christian philanthropy. We refer in particular to the work of your 'Christian Commission,' with its rich provision for the temporal and spiritual wants of your soldiers and sailors; and we hope that all churches shall profit by this noble exhibition of Christian love in a singularly arduous and self-sacrificing sphere of labor.

"We have special pleasure in referring to the sympathy lately awakened on behalf of America among all classes in Britain, by the assassination of your great and good President; and we adore the Most High, who has thus turned one of the blackest crimes of our age into a means of softening down asperities of feeling, of correcting grave misunderstandings, of fusing the hearts of nations in love, above all, of calling forth in full measure the prayers of Christ's people on this side of the Atlantic on behalf of your sorely-stricken land. We rejoice that your country is to have rest from war, and that the restoration of peace is to be followed by the abolition of slavery. No words could better express our views than those of your lamented President, written in April, 1864; 'I claim not to have controlled events, but confess plainly that events have controlled me. Now, at the end of three years' struggle, the nation's condition is not what either party, or any man devised or expected. God alone can claim it. Whither it is tending seems plain. If God now wills the removal of a great wrong, and wills also that we of the North, as well as you of the South, shall pay fairly for our complicity in that wrong, impartial history will find therein new causes to attest and revere the justice and goodness of God.' The divergence of sentiment and action formerly existing between you and us as to this question thus ceases, and we give the glory to Him, who is righteous in all his ways and holy in all his works. As there is really nothing now to prevent a complete and cordial understanding between the British and the American churches, we take the earliest possible opportunity of giving utterance to this conviction and desire of our hearts. Our prayers shall rise with yours to the throne of grace in asking for your rulers and your people all heavenly wisdom in dealing with one of the weightiest social problems ever presented to any country for solution. We shall watch with the liveliest interest the future history of the negro race within your borders; and you have our best wishes for

the success of every scheme bearing on their temporal or spiritual welfare. We are by no means forgetful of our former share of National guilt as to negro slavery, and it would ill become us to judge you harshly or unadvisedly. But, it is right and proper that we should encourage you by our British experience—for the abolition of slavery in our West India Islands removed a great stumbling-block out of our path—it led to a marked quickening of the public conscience—it gave our country a far higher Christian place among the nations, and it enabled all the churches to proclaim with fullness and sincerity the gospel of salvation through Him, who came to undo the heavy burdens and to break every yoke. We have no doubt that your churches will be ready to follow where Providence now points the way.

"As the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, we have every cause to reciprocate sentiments of brotherly kindness and charity toward members of the same Presbyterian family with ourselves. We must all feel the necessity for closer fellowship between churches that have a common language, a common ancestry, a common faith. Presbyterianism would thereby become vastly more influential for good. It would bulk more largely in the eye of Christendom and every section of our ecclesiastical commonwealth would get enlargement of heart by partaking of the heritage of truth and grace common to all. We beg to add that the greatest advantage would follow from the occasional visits of accredited deputies from your churches to us, and from us to you. We have much to learn from your varied schemes of Christian usefulness in dealing with a state of society so different from ours; and we know from the testimony of Dr. Duff and many others, that in the field of heathenism there are no missionaries of more truly apostolic spirit than those sent forth by the churches of America. You on your part might also find it not unprofitable to study the working of Presbyterianism in Scotland, fragrant as our beloved country is with the memories of the martyrs, and earnestly contending, as it still does, for the faith once delivered to the saints. We must not forget, however, that there are other churches beyond the circle of Presbyterianism, with which we desire to cultivate a spirit of concord, and from the field of whose experience we seek to gather like precious fruit. Let us provoke one another to love and to good works. Let us strive, as in the fire, to prevent at any subsequent time the possibility of estrangement between our respective nations. Let us pray that the same blessed spirit, poured down so largely on your land during the period of your revival, may become the living bond of unity and peace between us. And let us ever realize the solemn fact that, humanly speaking, the Christian interests of the world hang mainly on the efforts put forth by Christ's people in Great Britain and America.

"And now, dear brethren, we beseech the God of all grace to overrule these shakings of the nations for the upbuilding of that kingdom which cannot be moved; and we affectionately commend you to Him who will give strength to his people, and who will bless his people with peace. For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things—to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.

"Signed in name and by authority of the Free Church of Scotland, at Edinburgh, the thirtieth day of May, in the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, by James Begg, D. D., Moderator of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland."

In behalf of the Committee appointed to answer this letter, Professor Smith presented the following resolutions, and reply to the letter, which were adopted by the Assembly :

The General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, in a letter bearing date May 30th, 1865, having proposed to us a closer fellowship by "occasional visits of accredited deputies" from our respective churches, and the same proposal having been confirmed in the address of Rev. James McCosh, LL. D., therefore,

Resolved, That this Assembly accede to this proposal for an interchange of deputies on such specific terms as may hereafter be designated, and that two deputies be appointed to represent our Church at the next General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, in Edinburgh, May, 1867.

Resolved, That the Committee having in charge the correspondence with the Free Church of Scotland, be authorized to make this appointment in the name of the General Assembly.

Resolved, That we tender to the Rev. James McCosh, LL. D., our sincere thanks for the able and eloquent manner in which he has discharged his office as virtual, if not technical, representative of the Free Church of Scotland; that we offer him the assurance of our personal honor and regard; and that we pray for his continued and unceasing success and influence in the great and useful labors to which his life is devoted.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, (N. S.) in session in the First Presbyterian Church in the city of St. Louis, Missouri, May 28th, 1866, to the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, greeting:

DEAR BRETHREN: The most welcome letter of your venerable Assembly, bearing date Edinburgh, May 30th, 1865, and subscribed by your Moderator, the Rev. James Begg, D. D., has been received by our Assembly with heart-felt gratitude and approval. We warmly reciprocate your affectionate Christian salutations, and respond with lively emotions to your expression of sympathy and confidence, and to your proposals for a closer fellowship. Though separated by broad ocean, we are bound together by no ordinary ties. No Church of another land has a stronger hold than yours upon our love and honor. The one reformed faith is our common heritage. We express that faith in the same symbols; we have, in essence, the same Presbyterian polity; and we are equally engaged in kindred Evangelical labors at home and abroad. There are also between us many ties of a common ancestry; we venerate the names of your early reformers; our ministry are still instructed by the reading of your great divines; our faith is strengthened by the bright example of your heroic martyrs, who fought a good fight for religious and civil liberty; and in your special conflicts and sacrifices for a Free Church, you have had,

these twenty years, our constant and warmest sympathy. We honor the high wisdom and extraordinary liberality which have made you prosperous and strong, and the new testimony you have given to the self-sustaining power of the Christian Church, when contending for its righteous liberties. It is a good thing that the sacred fire kindled by the old covenants is still burning in the heart of Scotland, and that their flaming torches have been handed down from sire to son. In all these things, dear brethren, we do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.

It is then, with no ordinary satisfaction, that we have received your proposal for an interchange of accredited deputies between our churches, as occasion may serve. As you will see by an accompanying Minute, this Assembly has unanimously resolved to appoint two such deputies to represent us before your venerable Assembly in May, 1867. They will, in due time, be named and commissioned, and we bespeak for them a fraternal welcome. We also invite you to send deputies to our own Church, at its next session in the city of Rochester, in the State of New York, May, 1867, assuring them a most cordial reception.

We have this year been favored with an address made in your behalf, by the Rev. James McCosh, LL. D., of Belfast, Ireland, who came to us with ample testimonials from several of the honored ministers of your Church. Already known to us by his elaborate and thoughtful works, so important in relation to the great conflict between Christianity and some of the forms of modern infidelity, he hardly needed any external recommendation to insure him an attentive hearing. His eloquent and sympathetic words have drawn us to you by the cords of a common faith and love.

The sympathy you express in the calamities and sufferings brought upon us by our recent war, in the assassination of our beloved and venerated President Lincoln, a martyr to the cause of human freedom, and your fervent congratulations upon the abolition of slavery throughout our States, as well as your wise suggestions, derived in part from your British experience in respect to the future condition of the negro race, call for our grateful recognition. These things have weighed, and still weigh upon the mind and the conscience of this Nation. God has guided us by his wonder-working Providence, bringing good out of evil. He has sorely chastised us for our National sins, and we bow in penitence, yet in trust, beneath His mighty hand. He has indeed caused the wrath of man to promote His own high purposes of grace and wisdom, and in the difficulties and perplexities that still beset our path, in the vast social and political, as well as religious problems, that we are called upon to solve, we humbly invoke, and rely upon His wisdom and grace. Here, too, we feel assured that your prayers will mingle with ours.

You say that "the divergence of sentiment and action formerly existing between us, on the question of slavery, has now ceased," and, "as there is really nothing now to prevent a complete and cordial understanding between the British and the American Churches, we take the earliest possible opportunity of giving utterance to this conviction and desire of our hearts." We thank you for these words; we unite with you in the petition for the removal of all estrangement and the establishment, not only of our old, but even of a better and nearer friendship. And because of this our common wish and purpose, we are emboldened to say to you, with the utmost Christian frankness, as well as affection, that during the progress of our recent and terrible struggle for the very life of our nation, involving as it did by a vital necessity the emancipation of the slaves, we have

at times been deeply pained and grieved by the apparent indifference of the British Churches to the great principles and the manifest moral issues that were here at stake. From the beginning of the great rebellion, our American Churches, as with one voice, proclaimed the real nature of the contest. Our own Assembly never faltered or wavered in the declarations, that it was essentially a conflict between freedom and slavery, and that national unity was necessary to national freedom. And we shall ever more regret that in our darkest days, when we were in travail in the throes of a new birth, and when sympathy would most have cheered our hearts, we had, with few exceptions, such slight encouragement from those so nearly allied to us in faith and in the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty. But those dark hours are past, nevermore, we trust, to return, and we are glad that the clouds are dispersing, and the mists vanishing away, and that we are coming to see eye to eye, and to know better each other's hearts and minds.

You allude to the interest with which you "shall watch the future history of the negro race within our borders." The views of this Assembly on some of the points herein involved are set forth in a declaration just adopted on the state of the country, a copy of which will be sent to you. The freedom of that unhappy and long-suffering race has been bought at a great price of blood and treasure. Slavery is now prohibited by an amendment to the Constitution. The civil rights of the freedmen have been secured by law. Other guarantees will doubtless follow in due time. This nation is under the most solemn responsibility as to the future destiny of this class of its citizens. Meanwhile, our chief reliance must be on those social, moral and religious influences which alone can make men fit for freedom and truly free—and which alone can fully restore the Union of the States, and bind us together in a common brotherhood.

In these troubled times, even when the horrors of war were upon us, the Great Head of the Church has given us fresh occasion to magnify his faithfulness. Our American Churches, no less than our Republic, have emerged from this conflict still strong in their faith and order. The principles of our American Christianity have received a new vindication. Our benevolent contributions have been constantly increasing. And we are now girding ourselves for the great task that is laid upon us, especially in our Southern and Western States, among our freedmen and our emigrant population, and against the progress of Romanism, of materialism, and of a false rationalism, in humble reliance, as we trust, upon the grace and wisdom of Him who will not leave us if we lean upon his mighty arm and follow the guidance of His all-wise Providence. An increased desire for Christian union, too, has been kindled throughout our land. Many of our Churches, also, have been visited with fresh outpouring of the spirit of grace, showing that the Lord is at work amongst us as of old.

We, too, desire with you in a special manner, a closer fellowship between the Presbyterian churches in our own and other lands. We are glad to see the movements in this direction in England and Scotland, and in your colonial dependencies. The same spirit is at work among ourselves. The two great branches of the Presbyterian Church in this country are drawing nearer together; this year they have touched each other, and each of our Assemblies has appointed a Committee of Conference and Reunion. Our Deputies will inform you of the progress of this desirable object. And we fervently hope that here, as never before, all

Christian Churches may forget their lesser differences and unite together, so far as possible, in the great work of the Lord.

Dear brethren, beloved in the Lord, we send to you these, our Christian salutations, beseeching you to pray for us. We commend you unto God, and to the word of His grace. May the one Great Head of the Church bless you with all spiritual blessings. May our Churches and our lands live in amity and unity. May we all live for the Glory of God in the kingdom of his Son, our Lord, to whom be praise forever. Amen.

THE REUNION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

The fact that both Assemblies met in the same city facilitated the projects for reunion, which have been so generally discussed during the two past years. They came to understand one another better. The circumstances of the country and the times, and the needs of many of our weaker churches, also tended in the same direction. Many of the past issues are dead and buried. The zeal for doctrinal strife has abated. Congregational tendencies have been eliminated from the so-called New School. The Old School has been purging itself from complicity with Southern institutions. The Old and New Schools are united at the South. The Old School Assembly at St. Louis fought a good fight against that small and vanishing minority who cannot give up their sympathy with Southern treason and slavery, though both these are practically abolished: and this drew the majority into closer affinity with us.* All the propositions, in fact, in respect to

* On this subject we make the following extract from the Pastoral Letter of the Old School Assembly:

"One other topic demands our consideration. In consequence of the rebellion and slavery, and of the deliverances of the five preceding Assemblies thereupon, one presbytery in the church, and some one hundred or more ministers and elders, have set themselves against these deliverances by ecclesiastical action, or formal organization, and have published their schismatical doctrines to the world. The disapprobation by ministers and members of the acts of the General Assembly, when expressed in proper terms and spirit, and with due acknowledgment of subordination to its authority, is a right which belongs to every one under its jurisdiction. The General Assembly claims no infallibility: but it possesses a clear authority derived from the Lord Jesus Christ, and its acts resulting from such authority are to be respected. No combination of ministers or members may properly be formed within the bosom of the Presbyterian Church for the purpose of openly resisting the authority of the General Assembly, and of setting at naught and contemning its solemn decisions, while the individuals composing such combinations still claim all the rights and privileges of ministers and members; much less may any lower court of the church thus repudiate the Assembly's authority, and still claim and exercise all the powers of a court in good standing. The prin-

reunion came from the Old School, and were most manly and cordial in their tone. Dr. Stanton, the Moderator of their Assembly, in the first week of the session, replying to our honored delegate, Dr. Nelson, said :

"I can respond most heartily, and I think the vast majority of this Assembly can respond also to the sentiment that we are drawing nearer together than we have been during this generation, or since this division occurred ; and I may express on my behalf, and I trust on behalf of a large majority of this Assembly, that we hope the time is not distant when we shall not only be, as I am confident we now are, one in spirit, but one by organic law ; and that then these two branches of the great Presbyterian family may stand forth in one solid phalanx against error and corruption.

"You have intimated, and undoubtedly it is true, that in the providence of God it is not yet quite clear as to the time and the manner in which this organic union may be brought about. Many have supposed that, from the simple fact that the two Assemblies met in the same city, (the meeting being determined without concert between them,) that the time had come when there should be an organic union ; and they have

ciple which would admit this would prove destructive of any government, secular or religious, for it is the essence of anarchy. Notwithstanding this, several Presbyterians have openly declared that they will not regard the Assembly's authority, especially the acts of the last Assembly concerning the terms of receiving ministers and members from the Southern Presbyterian church. We trust that upon further reflection they will reconsider such action, and again show a proper subordination. One presbytery, however, that of Louisville, in the Synod of Kentucky, adopted a paper in September last, called a 'Declaration and Testimony,' which arrays itself against all the deliverances of the five Assemblies from 1861 to 1865, enacted upon slavery and rebellion. This paper has been signed by certain ministers and elders in other presbyteries and synods, chiefly in the Synod of Missouri. The present Assembly felt called upon to take decisive action in the premises. This paper exhibits organized rebellion and schism within the bosom of the church, whose design is to resist the authority of the General Assembly. It pronounces the last five Assemblies guilty of heresy, schism, and virtual apostasy. Such an organization, with such aims, bringing such charges, and animated by such a spirit as the said paper exhibits, the Assembly could not overlook. The simple question presented was, whether a single subordinate court, with such individuals of other presbyteries as might join it, should be allowed to carry on its schismatical and rebellious schemes with impunity, and still claim and exercise all the rights of a court, and the individuals concerned have all the rights of office-bearers in the church accorded to them, while openly defying the General Assembly ; or whether the Assembly, which represents the whole church, should require due subordination and respect to its authority. The signers of the said paper openly avow their determination to continue agitation against the solemn acts of the last five Assemblies, until they shall bring the church, through action of the General Assembly, to their views, or, failing in this, they declare that they may feel called upon to abandon the church.

"In this posture of affairs the Assembly could not hesitate in its duty. It censured all the persons who have signed the "Declaration and Testimony," deprived them of the right to sit in any church court above the session, and cited them to the bar of the next General Assembly. This measure was clearly justified, and was demanded for the purity, peace, and order of the church."

expected that that organic union might now be formed. I hope, before we adjourn, a low me to say, and if it shall meet the views of the body you represent, I hope you, before you adjourn, may initiate measures (perhaps beginning here, and being responded to by you) looking to a more close fellowship in all our relations, and ultimately, as soon as the providence of God may open the way, to an organic union. And now, as the time for adjournment has passed, I will close my remarks. I believe I have expressed the sentiments of a vast majority of this Assembly, to show you that we heartily sympathize with you in all your efforts to promote the cause of Christ, and we congratulate you on all the success you have attained."

During the next week two joint meetings of a religious and fraternal character, were held, with the most auspicious results. On Monday evening (May 21st) the church in which the sessions of the Old School were held was filled with an animated throng, who responded heartily to all that was said about Christian fellowship, by the two Moderators, Judge Chamberlain, Dr. McCosh, Dr. Parker of Newark, and Professor Smith. It was an impressive occasion. At the conclusion, the whole audience rose, as if spontaneously, in response to a resolution affirming that reunion was desirable and practicable. At the united Communion service, in Dr. Nelson's church, a still deeper feeling of Christian fellowship was engendered; two brothers, one from each Assembly, Dr. Humphreys of Danville, and Dr. Humphreys of Chicago, symbolized the fraternity of the two bodies. On Saturday Dr. Gurley and Judge Clark made felicitous addresses to our Assembly, to which the Moderator responded in appropriate terms. Dr. Gurley's weighty words were enforced by his presentation of the following resolutions from his Assembly:

Resolved, That this Assembly expresses its fraternal affection for the other branch of the Presbyterian Church, and its earnest desire for the reunion at the earliest time consistent with agreement in doctrine, order, and polity, on the basis of our common standards, and the prevalence of mutual confidence and love, which are so necessary to a happy union, and to the permanent peace and prosperity of the united church.

Resolved, That it be recommended to all our churches, and church courts, and to all our ministers, ruling elders, and communicants to cherish fraternal feelings, to cultivate Christian intercourse in the worship of God, and in the promotion of the cause of Christ, and to avoid all needless controversies and competitions adapted to perpetuate division and strife.

Resolved, That a Committee of nine ministers and six ruling elders be appointed, provided that a similar Committee shall be appointed by the

other Assembly now in session in this city, for the purpose of conferring in regard to the desirability and practicability of reunion, and if, after conference and inquiry, such reunion shall seem to be desirable and practicable, to suggest suitable measures for its accomplishment, and report to the next General Assembly."

This was immediately followed by the presentation of the following Report from the Committee on the Polity, Dr. H. B. Smith, Chairman, to which all the overtures on the subject of reunion had been referred:

"These overtures, Nos. 5 to 15, were from the Presbyteries of New York 3d and 4th, Dubuque, Greencastle, Athens, Steuben, Alton, Monroe, Keokuk, Long Island, and Trumbull. All these Presbyteries, with different degrees of urgency, recommend to this Assembly to initiate or respond to proposals looking to an entire reunion of the churches represented by the two General Assemblies now in session in the city of St. Louis.

"The General Assembly now in session in the Second Presbyterian Church of this city have also adopted resolutions appointing a Committee to confer with a similar committee of our own Church in regard to the desirableness and practicability of such a reunion.

"Your Committee recommend to this Assembly the adoption of the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That this Assembly tender to the Assembly representing the other branch of the Presbyterian Church, its cordial Christian salutations and fellowship, and the expression of its earnest wish for a reunion on the basis of our common standards, received in a common spirit.

"*Resolved*, That a Committee of fifteen, nine of whom shall be ministers of the Gospel, and six elders, be appointed to confer on this subject, in the recess of the Assembly, with the Committee to be appointed by the other General Assembly, and to report the result at our next General Assembly.

"*Resolved*, That we enjoin upon this Committee, and upon all our ministers and church members, to abstain from whatever may hinder a true Christian fellowship, to cherish and cultivate those feelings and purposes which look to the peace and prosperity of Zion, the edification of the body of Christ, and the complete union of all believers, especially of those living in the same land, having the same history and the same standards of doctrine and polity.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions, with the names of our Committee, be sent to the other General Assembly, now in session in this city."

The Report of the Committee was unanimously adopted amid applause and demonstrations of great satisfaction.

The Committee of Conference appointed by our Assembly consists of the Rev. Drs. Thos. Brainerd, William Adams, Edwin F. Hatfield, Jonathan F. Stearns, P. H. Fowler, J. B. Shaw, H. I. Hitchcock, of Ohio, R. W. Patterson, and Henry

Nelson; and of Judges Allison and Williams, E. A. Lambert, T. P. Handy, R. W. Steele, and W. H. Brown, Elders.

The Committee appointed by the Old School consists of Drs. Krebs, Beatty of Ohio, Bickus, Gurley, Montfort, Howard, Schenck, Reed, and Brown of Chicago; and Elders Say, McKnight, Galloway, Clarke, Strong, and Beatty of Kentucky.

This weighty subject is thus brought into a position in which definite and decisive action must be taken upon it. Both Assemblies will have full confidence in the wisdom and Christian spirit of the Committees that have been appointed. There is ample time for deliberation and discussion. These Committees have a difficult and momentous work to accomplish, in its ultimate bearings second in importance to no subject now before the Christian churches of this land. There are some undeniable difficulties in the way. There must be concessions on both sides. But no local or merely personal interests ought to be allowed to stand in the way of reunion, if both churches are really so near together in doctrine and polity, in heart and mind, as to make it practicable. And no terms must be insisted upon by either side that look like dictation, or that will infringe upon the self-respect of either body. Practical difficulties as to Boards and Committees can be disposed of, if the main question is satisfactorily adjusted. Some constitutional changes may also be necessary, that the united Assembly may not be a too unwieldy body, and unfit to do the work of a Church Court. Perhaps a Commission, to sit in the recess of the Assemblies, may be found advisable for the more important judicial cases. And proper care should also be taken so to define the province and rights of the General Assembly that it shall not transcend its peculiar and special sphere, and become a legislative and executive instead of a judicial body. It might also be well to have some arrangement by which the Assembly, through its proper officers, shall be able to continue some of its functions during the eleven and a-half months in which it is not in session.

The future history and fortunes of Presbyterianism in this country, and on this continent, are deeply involved in the re-

sult that will now be reached. If it is successful, the smaller Presbyterian churches will probably before many years coalesce with us; and an impulse will be given to all the denominations in the line of Christian union and reunion, counteracting the extreme tendency to subdivisions that has hitherto existed. If it fail, the attempt cannot probably be renewed under equally favorable auspices for many a year to come, if ever. We are, in fact, deciding the question, whether Presbyterianism in this land is to be split up into local, provincial synods and assemblies, or whether we can really have an American Presbyterian Church, stretching all through the country. The Southern churches will doubtless for a time remain separate; and it is better that they should do so; but bye-and-bye, when the passions of the war are lulled, we may hope that, if we be reunited, they will come back, in a better mind, to the old fellowship.

If we cannot reunite, we shall be left to struggle on, doing our work side by side, in perpetual rivalry in all the new States, Territories and towns, so rapidly rising up. And meanwhile other, more wise and flexible, denominations will be united, will stretch each as one body through the whole country, while we are contending with each other. The Episcopal Church, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Congregationalists, and the Roman Catholics, are, or will become, united, compact and national churches. Must we be left to division on points of polity and doctrine, which it is difficult for any but the initiated to understand? Slavery is out of the way. Old jealousies are dying out. The spirit of returning love and unity is abroad in our churches. United, we can do a work for Christ, second to that done by no church in the United States. Every wise Christian man, who loves his Church and his land, will pause long before he speaks the word that would hopelessly sunder those two great churches that are now holding out to each other the hands of amity and unity.

NARRATIVE ON THE STATE OF RELIGION.

We have room for only a bare extract of Dr. Taylor's interesting Report on this topic:

Eighty-nine out of the one hundred and ten Presbyteries on the roll had forwarded their annual reports for examination. One hundred and thirteen churches were reported to have enjoyed revivals of religion during the previous year, and in response to the prayers of the churches, two hundred and fourteen revivals were specially mentioned this year. The subjects of the work had been mainly youths between twelve and twenty. Many of them had begun in, but they had rarely been confined to the Sabbath-schools. The chief agencies of the work had been "the ordinary means of grace." The revivals had been most fruitful in churches under the care of settled pastors. The in-gathering is still going forward. Six Presbyteries give an aggregate of one thousand and forty-eight additions by profession. A number of churches had doubled their membership, several had received over two hundred on profession of faith, since their revivals began. The eye of faith could see many promising omens of the continuance of the work. Three thousand five hundred conversions were reported by our home missionaries; fifty churches have been organized, and many old churches resuscitated. Noticeable in the narratives a strong desire for reunion with the other branch. In some places, where the Spirit of God has been poured out the most abundantly, the work of revival begun in an open and bold attack of all the most prominent vices of society. The Sabbath-schools were mentioned as being in a very flourishing condition. Churches had generously contributed in the efforts for religious education among the freedmen.

The benevolence of the church is shown to be somewhat on the increase; the aggregate of its contributions is larger than during any previous year, yet the standard of giving is below the ability of the Church as a whole. The lack of means to build churches is the great drawback in the frontier States. Looking at the condition of the Church from either a worldly or a religious stand-point, its prosperity appears greater than at any previous period.

An excursion to the famous Iron Mountain are among the pleasant incidents of this session of the Assembly. The day was fine; the members were in a highly patriotic, and Christian, and cheerful mood; and Dr. Nelson was an admirable master of ceremonies. The time was chiefly spent at Pilot Knob, on account of the greater breadth of view. Just below was the fort so gallantly defended by General Ewing with his six hundred men, against the confederate ten thousand under Price; one of the most gallant actions of the war. Across the plain is Shepherd's Mountain, abounding in magnetic ore, 600 feet high, covering an area of 800 acres. Pilot Knob is 581 feet above the plain, covers an area of 360 acres, and contains, it is estimated, 12,972,773 tons of pure iron; its ore has about 75 per cent. of iron. Six miles nearer St. Louis is the Iron Mountain, 228 feet high, with an area of 500 acres, and estimated to contain (we hardly dare write it down) 239,187.

375 tons of pure iron. They might have left out the 375 tons in the estimate; but we suppose they wanted to be very exact.

The hospitality of St. Louis did not seem to be taxed by the presence of even the two Assemblies. It was certainly cordial and bountiful. That beautiful city, freed with its State from the depressing influence of slavery, is destined to a grand career, in that most magnificent valley of the world. What a boundless opportunity is stretching out before our land and our churches! What a work we have to do! Who can think upon it without having his pulse stirred, and his heart enlarged, and his thoughts elevated! We are laying the foundations of the greatest empire this world has known. We are to help in planting a Christian civilization in these wide and teeming plains, in these boundless valleys, along these majestic views, along the whole line of the iron road that will now bind us to the Pacific coast. We must be up and doing. We must send every dollar and every man that we can into these inviting fields, to sow the seed and reap the harvest. Some of our young men will see the population of this land doubled. Our little ones may see it reach a hundred millions. And, under God, the church of this generation is to decide the question, whose shall be that increase. Never were the responsibility of any churches so great, as is that of our American churches now; never were any churches called to give so much, and to do so much in the same span of life. But if Christ be our leader, and we follow in his steps, the end is sure.

ART. VII.—CRITICAL NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

THEOLOGY.

The Church of England a Portion of Christ's one Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity. An EIRENISM, in a Letter to the Author of "The Christian Year." By E. B. PUSEY, D. D. New York: Appleton & Co. 1866. pp. 395. Dr. Pusey, in this interesting Letter, discusses the points of difference between the Roman and the Anglican Churches, in a conciliatory, not to say a compromising, spirit. To the

papal supremacy, the Mariolatry of the Church of Rome, and to some of its superstitious observances, he presents decisive objections from history, reason and Scripture. A certain primacy of honor he would be willing to concede to the Roman See, but not its claims to temporal authority. On the score of doctrine he is willing to make large concessions. He says, on p. 37, "there is not one statement in the elaborate chapters on Justification in the Council of Trent, which *any of us could fail of receiving*; nor is there one of their anathemas on the subject which in the least rejects any statement of the Church of England." One of these anathemas is directed against those who say "that justifying faith is only trust in the Divine mercy remitting our sins on account of Christ, and that faith alone justifies." This is the Protestant ground, and on this point Dr. Pusey has abandoned the position of the Reformers.

The work, though not very methodical, contains much that will interest those who wish to ascertain the current of English thought. As an *Eirenism* to the papacy it cannot avail much; for the Church of Rome must maintain the articles to which Dr. Pusey objects. But it may facilitate the transition of Anglicans to Rome. This will probably be its only practical effect.

The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost: or, Reason and Revelation. By HENRY EDWARDS, ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. pp. 274. By Reason, Archbishop Manning means all in modern thought that runs counter to the claims of the Roman Catholic Church; by Revelation, he means all that that Church enjoins in matters of truth and doctrine. And the object of his work is to show, that the only way of settling the conflict between the two is for all of us to accept the doctrine of papal infallibility. This is a thesis as easy to state as it is difficult to prove; but the proof is made easy, consisting chiefly of assertions and illustrations. Dr. Manning can write at times with force and eloquence; but he does much better in sermons than in controversial discussions. This work contains an unqualified endorsement of the whole ultramontane theory. In one passage he alludes to our country, saying, that "democracy is going to pieces before our eyes." But this was probably written while the rebellion was still flagrant.

Christian Unity and its Recovery. By JOHN S. DAVENPORT. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. pp. 119. This contribution to the question of the recovery of Christian unity is from a devoted member of the "Holy Catholic Apostolic Church," commonly called Irvingite. Many of its arguments against sectarianism, and against the Roman Catholic and Episcopal projects of reunion and unity, are excellent; and its position that we should have one body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, is undoubtedly scriptural. Whether this is to come through a new, supernatural revival of the apostleship, is a different question. The tone of the discussion is excellent.

A Hand-Book of Christian Baptism. By R. INGHAM. London. 1865. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. pp. 624, closely printed. If anybody wants to see about all that can be said on the Baptist side of the question, How much water must be applied to a person in order to make him a real member of the visible church? he will be abundantly satisfied even before he has quite got through this thick volume. It is apparently an exhaustive Hand-Book of the matter, compiled with great assiduity,

and written in a good spirit. Some of the concluding reflections on "Charity, with respect to Strict and Close Communion," are worthy of consideration. We hope bye-and-bye to see published an equally extensive and much more learned thesaurus, from the other side, which has been written by a minister of our church, and which we know to be a work of careful and solid erudition.

Sermons and Expositions. By the late JOHN ROBERTSON, D. D., *Glasgow Cathedral.* With a *Memoir of the Author*, by the REV. J. C. YOUNG. A. Strahan: London and New York. 1865. pp. lxxiv. 306. Dr. Robertson was born in Perth in 1824, and died in 1865, ere he had completed his forty-first year. He was in early life distinguished for his quick and careful scholarship, and had brilliant success as a student at St. Andrew's University. He was first settled in 1848 in the parish of Mains, and in 1858 succeeded Principal Macfarlan in the Cathedral Church, Glasgow, where he remained till his early death. His power was in the careful study and the earnest thoughtfulness of his written discourses. He had little of the artificial aids to oratorical success, but he was eminently successful. His style is simple, grave and straightforward; his thoughts are clear, orderly and impressive. But there is more about him than this. He penetrated to the heart of the Christian system, and avoided the mere technicalities of orthodoxy, and so got hold of the deepest wants and best sympathies of the Christian. His two sermons on the Indwelling Christ, and that on the Value of the Simple Elements of Christianity, are in the main admirable. His sermons, too, grow in a living way out of the texts. The volume is a profitable one. It is published in a solid and tasteful style.

The Living Temple, or Scriptural Views of the Church. By JOHN S. STONE, D. D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 1866. pp. 354. Dr. Stone is now Lecturer in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia, and it is refreshing to read his candid, wholesome and scriptural views about the nature of the Church, in contrast with the pretensions of exclusive High Churchmen. The above work is a revision and enlargement of his well-known volume on "*The Church Universal*," published some years ago. His appeal as to the nature of the Church is at first directly to the Scriptures, and not to tradition. Of the latter he says: "We cannot receive any exterior documents, or authority, as necessary and sufficient to determine, with infallible certainty, what are the otherwise undiscoverable doctrines of the Bible, without thereby elevating those documents, or that authority, to a certainty and a value above those of the Bible itself." He shows clearly that the Church, in its most general idea, is "the congregation of the faithful;" and that though Episcopacy (in his view) may be needful to the well-being, it is not necessary to the being, of the Church. He shows, too, most convincingly, that the early English reformers adopted this view, and willingly recognized the "orders" of the continental reformed churches; and that they did not do this from ignorance of patristic history, nor from a transient sympathy, but from a settled, rational and scriptural conviction. While conceding this, Dr. Stone is still warmly attached to the faith and order of his own communion. The volume is timely, and will do good. It is handsomely brought out by the publisher.

BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

JOHN P. LANGE's *Critical, Doctrinal and Homiletical Commentary on the*

Scriptures. Edited by P. SCHAFF, D. D. Gospel of Mark, by LANGE. Revised, with Additions, by PROF. SHEDD, pp. 167. Gospel of Luke, by J. J. VAN OSTERZEE, D. D., of Utrecht. Translated, with Additions, by DR. SCHAFF, and REV. C. C. STARBUCK. pp. 405. Both in one volume. Charles Scribner and Co. New York. 1866. This solid volume is the second one of the American addition of Lange's Bible Work. The first is already in its sixth edition. Three others are in the press and will probably be published during the year. The works now published have the same general characteristics with the volume on Matthew, which has been so cordially welcomed. Dr. Shedd has carefully revised the Edinburgh translation of Lange's work, and added judicious notes and criticisms. Dr. Schaff translated and edited the first three chapters of Luke's Gospel; the rest of the book is translated and edited by a thorough scholar, the Rev. C. C. Starbuck. Considerable additions are made to the criticism of the text and to the exegetical notes, which increase the value of the work. Dr. Van Osterzee, the author of this commentary on Luke, is, perhaps, the ablest of the Evangelical divines of Holland: his contribution to Lange's Bible Work (viz. besides Luke, the Pastoral Epistles, the Epistles to Philemon, and the Doctrinal and Homiletic Divisions of the commentary on James) are among the best of the series. He is more lucid, compressed and definite than Lange, and does not lack warmth and unction. His exposition of Luke takes rank with the very best.

It is a matter of congratulation that so substantial and costly a work has already met with such general favor. This second volume is fully equal to the first in its merits, and ought to have a like success.

*How to Study the New Testament. The Gospels. The Acts of the Apostles, By HENRY ALFORD, D. D., Dean of Canterbury. Alexander Strahan: London and New York. pp. 355. The interesting and learned suggestions, as to the profitable study of the New Testament, contained in this volume, were first published in *Good Words*, and are now reproduced in a more permanent form. The object is to show the English reader the exact meaning of the original in contrast with the common English version, where the latter is defective; to explain difficulties, harmonize discrepancies; and, in short, to make the Gospels and Acts more intelligible. The Dean allows many difficulties to stand without attempting a solution, and is generally quite free in his criticisms. On many of the contested points, he will of course be contested. But he is an honest and candid critic. Some passages betray the marks of careless writing, though the general style of the book is simple. It will be found a valuable help to study.*

PHILOSOPHY.

An Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's Philosophy: being a defence of Fundamental Truth. By JAMES MCCOSH, LL. D. New York: R. Carter and Bros. 1866. pp. 434. Mr. Mill's attack on the intuitional school seems likely to meet with sturdy and able refutations. Dr. McCosh, though by no means a one-sided partisan of Sir William Hamilton, is a zealous opponent of Mr. Mill's peculiar theories, and in this large volume has subjected them to a thorough and satisfactory examination. In twenty-one chapters he reviews carefully and candidly all the leading questions debated by Mr. Mill in his examination of Hamilton, and comes on all the main points to judicious and conclusive results. Some of his analy-

ses and discriminations show a high degree of philosophic insight. The chapter on Body, for example, brings out the different theories of perception in a clear and convincing manner, and effectually demolishes Mr. Mill's general theory, as well as exposes his manifold inconsistencies. So, too, the question of Causation is well handled; and the logical theories of the inductive philosopher are keenly scrutinized.

The work is written in a flowing and popular, as well as in a conspicuous style. It will take rank, we think, alongside of any of the author's previous productions, and raise his reputation as a philosopher. It is a good thing, too, to hear such high and vital topics debated in so calm and courteous a style.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Life and Letters of FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON. Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, 1847-53. Edited by STOPFORD A. BROOKE, M. A. 2 vols. Boston. Ticknor and Fields. 1865. The interest of this biography centres in the character of the subject of it, and not in the skill of the biographer. There are few who, during the last eight or nine years, have become familiar with that series of sermons, bearing the name of Mr. Robertson, which, first ushered in unheralded, in a modest duodecimo volume, so interested us by their freshness of thought, their earnestness, their somewhat unusual selection of topics and mode of treatment, there are few of these we say, who have not often longed to know something more of the author. Who was he? What had been his training and discipline? What else had he done besides preaching these attractive discourses? With what wing of the English church did he officiate? for, singularly enough, from his sermons we could not exactly tell in what division of that body, which allows wide diversities of views within its communion, to place him. These volumes, in a measure, answer these questions.

Mr. Robertson was born in 1816. His early and strong preferences were for a military life, his father having been a captain in the Royal artillery. Disappointed in this, he turned to the clerical profession, was educated at Oxford, and ordained deacon in 1840. He at once entered upon his duties,—first at Winchester,—with an almost ascetic zeal. He devoted much time to Sunday-schools. He practiced austerities. He restricted himself from all but necessary expenses, and gave the rest of his income to the poor. For a year he almost entirely abstained from meat, and kept aloof from society. He thoroughly studied the works of Jonathan Edwards: pondered over the "Imitation of Christ," and read daily the lives of Henry Martyn and David Brainerd. He spent much time in prayer, systematizing his petitions, having one class of subjects for each day of the week. From Winchester he removed to Cheltenham, and thence, after some years of service, to Oxford, from which he went to the sphere of his most active and influential service at Trinity chapel, Brighton. Here his vigorous thought, his warm and generous sympathy, his active efforts, opened a way for him, and gathered a large congregation of hearers. His voice was charming, his action dignified, his manner self-possessed, and though the idea of being a popular preacher was most distasteful to him, he of necessity drew to himself a great body of interested hearers.

In the latter part of his life he somewhat turned away from the evangelical side of the English church. What were the causes of this, we do not know, nor exactly the nature or extent of the change in his opin-

ions. It seems to us rather a functional disturbance, if we may so speak, than involving an organic modification; the result of a dislike of men or measures, or what seemed narrowness, or harshness, or unwisdom, rather than a fundamental rejection of his early faith.

Mr. Robertson was of the most sensitive and delicately organized nature, full of courage and high spirit, one to be easily touched and deeply wounded. With all his physical vigor, he was subjected to most painful attacks of disease; with all his intellectual life and brilliancy, he suffered the deepest mental anguish. The causes of all this are not clearly developed in these volumes. The hints and allusions, which may be clear to an English reader, are dark to an American, so that we hesitate in our judgment.

The most attractive parts of these volumes are the letters where the author reveals his own soul. They are bright, thoughtful, and charming, abounding in good sense and discriminating suggestions. The occasional literary opinions and criticisms in which he indulges, are not their least attraction. These are always fresh and suggestive; often starting our minds on a new train of thought, or leading to a perception of new beauties.

In his later years Mr. Robertson was vexed and pained by opposition where he did not expect it, and distrust from those who once were friendly, but this did not disturb the deep interest with which we follow the earnest and beautiful, though incomplete and sad life, of one whom we cannot help loving. With all his fine genius, and penetrating insight, and sincerity, and high purpose, he seems to us to have been, during his late life, in that transition state through which minds of similar delicate nervous organization are sometimes made to pass before settling upon an immovable foundation. With more years and greater quiet, we should have looked for a return to his early faith, if he ever really essentially swerved from it, and a more serene and assured confidence. But perhaps so intense a life could not last long. He died on the 15th of August, 1853, at the early age of thirty-seven.

S. G. B.

A History of New England, from the Discovery by Europeans to the Revolution of the Seventeenth Century. By JOHN GORHAM PALFREY. 2 vols. Hurd and Houghton: New York. 1866. pp. 408. 426. Dr. Palfrey's larger work, in three volumes, entitled *History of New England during the Stuart Dynasty*, is here compressed into two, making an admirable manual of the history of the ancestors of about one-third part of the present white population of the United States, chiefly the descendants of the 21,000 Puritan Englishmen who came to this country before the Long Parliament of 1640. They form the most homogeneous and enterprising part of the whole population, and their influence has determined, more than that of any other portion, the general character and fortunes of the country. The New England history is divided by Dr. Palfrey into three periods of 86 years each, the 19th of April curiously giving the incident on which the division is made in 1689, 1775, and 1861. The present volumes are devoted to the first period.

Dr. Palfrey writes in the true spirit of a New Englander, yet with candor and justice. He defends the Puritans, but with a wise reserve on some points. Though not himself in sympathy with many of their ecclesiastical and theological views, he manifestly aims at impartiality. And he has produced a work, far superior to any of the popular accounts we have hitherto had. Much of the coloring of the old times is faithfully reproduced: and the social, as well as the political and ecclesiastical char-

acteristics of the primitive New England Puritans, are well delineated. The volumes are brought out by the publishers in an attractive and substantial style.

Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Part II. From Samuel to the Captivity. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D. D., Dean of Westminster. New York: Scribner and Co. 1866. pp. 656. This continuation of Dean Stanley's Lectures on the history of the old dispensation, is fully equal in the absorbing interest of the narrative to the previous volume. The mode of treatment is not that of a dry record of historic events, but rather an animated picture of historic scenes and of the actors in them. And Israel under its Kings is a worthy subject for a great historic artist. In all that concerns the external characteristics of the scenes, Dr. Stanley is entirely at home. The human motives and aspects of the events are brought out in bold and full relief. The divine element is not made as prominent as it is in the Biblical narrative. The divine interposition is not denied: miracles are allowed: but still the supernatural element is kept in the back-ground.

The critical student of this History will often find himself at a loss, as to the precise opinion entertained by the author, on many of the most difficult and debated points. He wavers as to the authority to be ascribed to the sacred text. It has manifestly with him about the same position with the annals and traditions of other nations, and not a special value as an inspired record. Dean Stanley makes as free use, for example, of the Septuagint where it differs from the Hebrew, as of the Hebrew original itself, and he is content with vague views where criticism demands greater definiteness. As a critical work his history cannot be compared with Ewald. But it is a picturesque and even brilliant narrative of the course of events in a form adapted to a deep popular impression.

History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M. A. Vols. V. VI. New York: Scribner & Co. 1866. These two volumes continue Mr. Froude's noble history from 1547 to 1559, from the death of Henry VIII. to the death of Mary. They exhibit in a striking way the same characteristics which we have noticed in giving an account of the previous volume; the same fullness of facts; a like impartiality in construing the facts; the same easy and continuous flow of the narrative. Mr. Froude's work is in almost every point of view a real addition to the history of England, in the most important period of that history—in its transition to those institutions which have made Great Britain so truly great and powerful. We intend to recur to these and the other volumes, giving a fuller account and estimate of them, when the reprint of the work shall be completed. Mr. Scribner deserves all encouragement in bringing such a beautiful edition within the reach of American scholars.

Life of Benjamin Silliman, M. D., LL. D., late Professor of Chemistry, Geology and Mineralogy in Yale College, Founder and Editor of the American Journal of Science and Arts, etc. By GEORGE P. FISHER, Professor in Yale College. 2 vols., crown 8vo. With fine Portrait and other illustrations. New York: C. Scribner & Co. 1866. This is the biography of no ordinary man and is full of interest and instruction. It is especially valuable as containing a full history of his labors in connection with the College with which his name is identified for more than half a century. Besides this historical narrative the volumes are ex-

ceedingly rich in reminiscences of distinguished personages, with whom Professor Silliman had personal intercourse or maintained correspondence. His letters to and especially from his many correspondents, among which were Chancellor Kent, Fenimore Cooper, Carl Ritter, Humboldt, Agassiz, Lyell, Murchison, Herschel, Mantell, and others equally celebrated, form a very remarkable and deeply interesting feature of the work. Prof. Fisher has discharged the delicate task assigned him for the most part with judgment, drawing the materials, and generally the language of the Memoir, from the reminiscences, diaries and correspondence prepared to his hand.

The Women of Methodism: Its Three Foundresses. By ABEL STEVENS, LL. D. New York: Carlton and Porter. 1866. The sketches here given of Susanna Wesley, the Countess of Huntington, and Barbara Heck, with brief notices of their female associates and successors in the early history of the denomination, are exceedingly interesting. Prepared at the request of the "American Methodist Ladies' Association," and denominational of course in its character, the book is still highly instructive to the general reader.

Dr. Stevens, who is thoroughly informed on this subject, briefly traces the influence of the Methodistic movement on the Nonconformity of England, and shows the active and commanding genius of woman in its accomplishment. Wesleyan Methodism was virtually founded by Susanna Wesley, the mother of Charles and Samuel; Calvinistic Methodism, by the Countess of Huntington, in co-operation with Whitefield; while to Barbara Heck belongs the honor of initiating the unparalleled career of American Methodism. The remarkable character of these women has been influential in the world for good to an extraordinary degree.

The Missionary Jubilee; an Account of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the American Baptist Missionary Union, May, 1864. With Commemorative Papers and Discourses. New York: Sheldon and Co. 1865. pp. 500. This is a volume of great value, not only as illustrating what the American Baptists have done for Foreign Missions, but also as showing their services in helping build up a manly Christian literature and educational and benevolent institutions in the country. After a full account of the Jubilee services in Philadelphia, we have an excellent discourse of Dr. Caldwell on the Missionary Resources of the Kingdom of Christ; Dr. Stow, on the Early Missionary History; Biographical Sketches, by Drs. Stow and S. F. Smith; a chapter on the Use of the Press in Missions; Missions in Relation to Denominational Growth, by Rev. K. Brooks; Missions in Relation to Denominational Belief and Polity, by Rev. Dr. S. Bailey; Missions in Relation to Educational Institutions, by Rev. Dr. H. J. Ripley; Development of the Benevolent Principle in the Baptist Denomination, by Dr. Babcock; Literature of American Baptists, by Rev. Dr. Wm. Crowell—a full and convenient summary, not elsewhere to be found; and other papers. The whole number of missionaries appointed has been 192, and 194 female assistants; of these 102 are deceased. In the Asiatic Missions, 200,382,898 pages of works in different languages have been printed, besides three millions in the Indian Missions. The contributions of the American Baptists for evangelizing purposes for the last fifty years amount to \$15,579,220, of which about three millions stand to the account of Foreign Missions. Such an exhibit of faithful Christian work gives high promise for the future. This numerous and powerful body of Christians has a great work before it in this and in other lands.

Temperance Recollections, Labors, Defeats, Triumphs. An Autobiography. By JOHN MARSH, D. D., Secretary of the American Temperance Union. New York: Scribner. 1866. This work of Dr. Marsh is the best and most authentic history of the Temperance Reform in this country that has been published. It is written in a candid and truth-loving spirit. The author is a veteran in the service, and is thoroughly acquainted with his subject. The volume deserves to have a wide circulation. The friends of the cause could not do it a better service than to aid in promoting it.

The Presbyterian Historical Almanac, and Annual Remembrancer of the Church for 1865. By JOSEPH M. WILSON. Vol. VII. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson. 8vo. pp. 407. The character of this "Almanac" is by this time so well known as not to need a description. It is an invaluable compendium of statistics of the whole Presbyterian family, and every pastor, church session, and intelligent Presbyterian ought to possess a copy of it. Mr. Wilson shows a degree of enterprise and industry in the preparation and publishing of this work, which certainly deserves not only commendation but pecuniary remuneration; and this can only be secured by securing a goodly circulation for his annual volume.

PRACTICAL RELIGION.

The Appletons publish another excellent work by Dr. EDWARD M. GOULDBURN, entitled *The Idle Word*, (pp. 208,) made up of short essays, originally in the form of sermons, on the gift of speech, and its employment in conversation. Among the topics considered are, the connection of speech with reason, the heavenly analogy of this connection, the definition and characteristics of "idle words," and hints for the guidance of conversation. The tone of the book is thoughtful and devout, and the practical directions are equally free from vagueness and exaggeration.

The Christian's Daily Treasury. By EBENEZER TEMPLE. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1866. pp. 432. The call for a second edition of this work is good evidence of the estimation in which it is held. It is made up of texts with brief and pertinent comments for each day of the year. Its use cannot fail to be of great benefit. The sentiments are evangelical.

Battle Echoes; or, Lessons from the War. By GEORGE B. IDE, D. D. Boston: same publishers. 1866. pp. 325. The religious aspects of our late war are brought out in this volume in a series of eloquent and forcible meditations and addresses. A patriotic and Christian spirit pervades and gives tone to the work. These religious lessons of the war we are but just beginning to learn, and they cannot be too impressively set forth.

The Young Lady of Pleasure. American Tract Society: New York. pp. 316. In a series of plain and familiar letters, the evils of a life devoted to the love of pleasure are forcibly depicted; the means are also indicated by which the vicious tendencies of our present social life, especially in the case of young ladies, may be guarded against and overcome. Christian mothers, and fathers, too, should ponder these wise suggestions. The evil aimed against is rapidly growing.

A Hand-Book of Scripture Harmony. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 1865. pp. 94. This is a convenient and useful manual, containing directions for reading the whole Bible in chronological order. The arrangement of the Old Testament is taken from Dr. Townsend's well known

work; the Harmony of the Gospels is from Dr. Robinson; and the Acts of the Apostles and Paul's Epistles are arranged on the authority of Dean Alford. The whole Bible, too, is divided into subjects.

Hymns for the Sick Room. New York: Randolph. 1866. pp. 130. The selections of hymns in this volume are very appropriate for all the exigencies of the sick room. It is a collection of hymns, and not of poems, and it will be found a source of comfort and strength to all who are in sorrow. Texts of Scripture, meditations and prayers are interspersed. Like all of Mr. Randolph's works, this is issued in an attractive style.

The American Sunday School Union has published two excellent works, brought out in good style: *Children's Party; a Day at Uplands*—a series of short tales and poems for children; and *Isa Graeme's World*, pp. 360, founded on fact. The latter story is exceedingly well told, and breathes throughout a healthful and elevated religious spirit. Such books cannot fail of doing good to a large circle of readers.

The Presbyterian Publication Committee have added some valuable works to their growing list, among which we note the *Social Hymn Book*, being identical with "The Social Hymn and Tune Book," which has become deservedly popular, (the tunes omitted) to adapt it to the lecture-room, prayer meeting and family. *Dutch Tiles*, or Loving Words about the Saviour. By EMMA S. BABURK. *What to do.* By E. L. LLEWELLYN. *Niff and his Dogs.* And *Black Steve*, or the Strange Warning. By MARTHA FARQUHARSON. The latter a strange and harrowing story of crime and hypocrisy; the others interesting Sunday-school Books. "What to do" will especially interest the young folks.

Sure Words of Promise; the Soul-Gatherer; The Cross of Jesus; by REV. DANIEL THOMPSON; and *Plain Words*, by CHARLES JOHN VAUGHAN, D. D. These four neat and tasty volumes (Carlton and Porter) are all on subjects of deep and general interest: Practical in cast, thoroughly evangelical in spirit, earnest and often vigorous in expression, they are books which the Christian may feed upon, and which all classes may read with profit. They are printed on tinted paper, uniform in size and binding, and would be a valuable addition to any Sunday-school library.

Six Months among the Charities of Europe. By JOHN DE LIEFDE. 2 vols. Alexander Strahan: London and New York. 1865. This celebrated English house has established a branch in this city, which brings its numerous publications directly to the notice and within the reach of the American public. The present work is an unpretending yet deeply interesting account of the rise, progress, and glorious results of the leading institutions of Germany, which are engaged in the work of Home Missions. The author spent six months in personally inspecting and acquainting himself with the history of twenty-six of these, and in reference to fifteen of them he gives us the benefit of his labors. He writes not in the spirit of criticism, but in full sympathy with the agencies and actors of whom he writes. The Institutions described are: The Deaconess House, at Kaiserwerth; Father Zeller's School, at Beuggen; The Deacon House, at Duisburg; The Asylum for Discharged Prisoners and Neglected Men, at Lintorf; The Establishment for Indigent Children, at Newhof; The Asylum for Poor Children, at Disselthat, and at Neukirchen; The Orphan House, at Lahr-Dinglingen; Pastor Heldring and his Establishments, near Hemmen; Agricultural Colony, at Rijasett; The Blind School, at Ilzarth; The Agricultural Colony, at Sainte Foy; Establishment of M. Bost, at Laforce; and The Deaconess Institution, in

Paris. The history of some of these, as here simply related, brings out the power of faith and prayer, and the efficiency of individual effort when nobly directed, in a most wonderful manner. This Inner Mission work has been of inestimable worth to the States of Germany during the last fifty years, the first great necessity for which was made painfully manifest by the wars of Napoleon, filling the land with widows and orphan children: it has done much to counteract the spirit of Rationalism and to revive the Evangelical faith and life there.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

Social Life of the Chinese. By REV. JUSTUS DOOLITTLE. With one hundred and fifty engravings. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1866. The author of this valuable work on China spent fourteen years, as a missionary, at Fuhchau, in the service of the American Board. He has therefore enjoyed the best of opportunities to acquaint himself with the inner life of this peculiar people; and we hesitate not to say that since the appearance of Williams' Middle Kingdom, no work on China equals this in the amount of exact and reliable information which it gives as to the customs, opinions, social life, and religious belief and practices of this singular people. A large part of the contents of these volumes originally appeared, in 1861-4, in the *Chinal Mail*, a newspaper published at Hong Kong. On his return to this country, Mr. D. was strongly urged by many of the most intelligent residents of China (English and American) to republish them in this country. The only regret is that the author could not have found the time to subject them to a more thorough and careful revision, and a systematic arrangement, which would have greatly added to the interest and value of the mass of facts which are here gathered up. But even in its present state, the work is a highly important contribution to a better understanding of that ancient, anomalous and little understood nation. The numerous illustrations, chiefly derived from photographic views, and from pen and ink sketches drawn by Chinese artists, are not the least novel and interesting feature of the work.

Thirty Years of Army Life on the Border. By COL. R. B. MARCY. New York: Harpers. 1866. pp. 452. This volume is handsomely got up, and fully illustrated, and contains vigorous and attractive accounts of Indian life upon the western plains; a trip across the Rocky Mountains in winter; descriptions of rare plants and animals; striking incidents from the lives of officers and army men and frontier men. It is a very interesting volume.

Shakspeare's Delineations of Insanity, Imbecility and Suicide. By A. O. KELLOGG, M. D. New York: Hurd and Houghton. 1866. pp. 204. Dr. Kellogg's experience as physician in the State Lunatic Asylum, Utica, N. Y., is turned to good account in this valuable criticism of Shakspeare. It illustrates by ample citations the great dramatist's acquaintance with the abnormal mental states; and shows that treatment of these diseases which is confirmed by modern science.

Esperance. By META LANDER. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1866. pp. 336. The author of this novel is favorably known by her previous works, "Marion Graham," etc. The aim of *Esperance* is to show how a true religious faith can be maintained under the most trying temptations, and to illustrate its influence over even the most abandoned. The author shows, especially in the more simple scenes and characters, de-

cided talent in her descriptions and delineations. In depicting the seductions and wickedness of fashionable life, she is not perhaps as happy or as instructive. There is considerable inequality in the merit of different parts of the volume. Esperance maintains a marked individuality. A sufficient variety of incidents and situations engages the interest of the reader throughout the course of the narrative.

A Noble Life. By the author of John Halifax, Gentleman. Harpers.

Half a Million a Year. By AMELIA B. EDWARDS. Harpers.

Both these novels are by highly popular authors, and are sure to command numerous readers. The former, by Miss Mulock, (henceforth to be known as Mrs. Craik,) is a story of very great interest. The lesson it inculcates is one of great moment, and her way of teaching it is happy and effective. Sir Guy is a character as rare as it is noble—living solely for others—rising above the disabilities and infirmities of his nature, and devoting time, wealth and position to doing good in a modest and unostentatious way. Would there were more such noble lives!

Miss Edward's new work, while not equal to her "Barbara's History," is one of decided merit. The tone of both is unexceptionable.

The Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell, afterwards Mistress Milton. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1856. pp. 271. Those who know this charming volume will welcome it in this beautiful reprint; those who do not, ought to make haste to read it. It is a gem of a book.

The True History of a Little Ragamuffin. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1866. A striking novel, made up of scenes in that class of society which is attracting increased attention from the philanthropic.

Gilbert Rugge. A Novel. By the author of "A First Friendship." New York: Harpers. 1866. An interesting tale.

Citoyenne Jacqueline; a Woman's Lot in the Great French Revolution. By SARAH TYTLER. London and New York: Alexander Strahan. 1865. pp. 499. This is a charming tale of life in France, giving minute and characteristic descriptions of local and domestic scenes and relations; and heightened to a tragic interest by the fortunes of the leading characters in the midst of the horrors and crimes of the French Revolution. It is a deeply interesting volume.

Walter Goring. A Story. By ANNIE THOMAS, author of "Dennis Donne," "On Guard," etc. Harper's Library of Select Novels. No. 265. The novels of Annie Thomas are attracting considerable attention. The plot of this one runs in the ways of love and intrigue, without any very strict regard to either conventional or moral rules.

The Toilers of the Sea. A Novel. By VICTOR HUGO. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. Fertility of invention, startling combinations, a rapid movement of the plot, and vivid descriptions, characterize all of Victor Hugo's romances; and this last one gives ample evidence that his genius is not flagging. It is marked, too, by the humanitarian tendencies that run through all his writings.

THE
A M E R I C A N
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

NEW SERIES. No. XVI.—OCTOBER, 1866.

ART. I.—THE DIFFERENT SPECIES OF SERMONS, AND THE
CHOICE OF A TEXT.

By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D. D., Professor in Union Theological Seminary.

IN classifying sermons, it is well to follow the example of the scientific man, and employ as generic distinctions as possible. It is never desirable to distinguish a great many particulars, and elevate them into an undue prominence by converting them into generals. That classification, therefore, which would regard the "applicatory" sermon, the "observational" sermon, and such like, as distinct classes, only contributes to the confusion and embarrassment of the inquirer. The three most generic species of sermons, are the *topical*, the *textual*, and the *expository*.

The Topical Sermon is one in which there is but a single leading idea. This idea sometimes finds a formal expression in a proposition, and sometimes it pervades the discourse as a whole, without being distinctly pre-announced. Topical sermons are occupied with one definite subject or topic, which can be accurately and fully stated in a brief title. South preaches a discourse of this kind from Numbers, xxxii. 23:

"Be sure your sin will find you out." The proposition of the sermon is this: "Concealment of sin is no security to the sinner." The leading idea of the discourse is, the *concealment* of sin; and the particular idea in the hearer to which this idea in the sermon is referred is, the idea of *happiness*.* The concealment of sin is incompatible with the soul's peace and enjoyment; and the positions by which the idea or proposition of the sermon is led back to this fundamental idea in the moral condition of the hearer are these: 1. The sinner's very confidence of secrecy is the cause of his detection. 2. There is sometimes a providential concurrence of unexpected events which leads to his detection. 3. One sin is sometimes the means of discovering another. 4. The sinner may unwittingly discover himself through frenzy and distraction. 5. The sinner may be forced to discover himself by his own conscience. 6. The sinner may be suddenly smitten by some notable judgment that discloses his guilt, or, 7. His guilt will follow him into another world, if he should chance to escape in this.

The topical sermon is more properly an oration than either of the other species. It is occupied with a single definite theme that can be completely enunciated in a brief proposition. All of its parts are subservient to the theoretical establishment of but one idea or proposition in the mind of the hearer, and to the practical realization of it in his conduct. In the case of the textual sermon, as we shall see when we come to examine it, there is less certainty of unity in the subject, and consequently less in the structure of the discourse. And the expository sermon partakes still less of the characteristics of oratory and eloquence.

Inasmuch as the topical sermon approaches nearest to the unity, and symmetry, and conveyance to a single point, of the oration proper, it is the model species for the preacher. By this is meant that the sermon, ideally, should contain one leading thought, rather than several. It should be the embodiment of a single proposition, rather than a collection of sev-

* THEREMIN: Rhetoric. pp. 72-75.

eral propositions. It should announce but one single doctrine in its isolation and independence, instead of exhibiting several doctrines in their interconnection and mutual dependence. The sermon should preserve an oratorical character. It should never allow the philosophical or the poetical element to predominate over the rhetorical. The sermon should be eloquence and not poetry or philosophy. It should be a discourse that exhibits singleness of aim, and a converging progress towards an outward practical end.

It is for this reason, therefore, that we lay down the position, that the topical sermon is the model species for the sermonizer. If he constructs a textual sermon, he should endeavor to render it as topical as is possible.* He should aim to pervade it with but one leading idea, to embody in it but one doctrine, and to make it teach but one lesson. In constructing an expository sermon, also, the preacher should make the same endeavor; and although he must in this instance be less successful, he may facilitate his aim, by selecting for exposition only such a passage of Scripture as has but one general drift, and conveys but one general sentiment.

The importance of this maxim may be best seen, by considering the fact, that sermons are more defective in respect to unity of structure, and a constant progress towards a single end, than in any other respect. But these are strictly oratorical qualities, and can be secured only by attending to the nature and laws of eloquence,—to the rhetorical as distinguished from the philosophical presentation of truth. Too many sermons contain matter enough for two or three orations, and consequently are not themselves orations. This is true of the elder English sermonizers, in whom the matter is generally superior to the form. Take the following plan of a sermon of South (in oratorical respects, the best of the earlier English

* This is not to be attained by making the plan a mixture of topical and textual,—by stating a proposition, and following with a purely textual division. The plan should be textual, but the style and movement of the discourse should be distinguished, so far as possible, by unity, simplicity, and progressiveness,—that is, by oratorical or topical qualities.

preachers) on Jer. vi. 15: "Were they ashamed when they had committed abomination? Nay, they were not at all ashamed, neither could they blush: therefore they shall fall among them that fall: at the time that I visit them they shall be cast down, saith the Lord." It is a topical discourse. The theme or proposition is: "Shamelessness in sin is the certain forerunner of destruction." The sermon contains sixteen pages, of which only four and a half are filled with matter that, upon strictly rhetorical principles, goes to establish the proposition. The first three quarters of the sermon are occupied with an analysis of the *nature* of "shamelessness in sin." The discourse is shaped too disproportionately by the category of truth,—a category that is subordinate, and should not be allowed so much influence in the structure and moulding of an oration.* The consequence is, that this sermon possesses far less of that oratorical fire and force so generally characteristic of South. It is not throughout pervaded by its own fundamental proposition. It does not gather momentum as it proceeds. There is no greater energy of style and diction at the end than at the beginning. It is clear; it is instructive; it has many and great excellencies; but it lacks the excellence of being a true oration,—a rounded and symmetrical discourse, pervaded by one idea, breathing but one spirit, rushing forward with a uniformly accelerating motion, and ending with an overpowering impression and influence upon the will. This discourse would be more truly topical, and thus more truly oratorical, if the proportions had been just the reverse of what they now are; if but one fourth of it had been moulded by the metaphysical category of truth, and the remaining three-fourths by the practical idea of happiness; if the discussion of the nature of shamelessness in sin had filled four pages, and the *reasons why* it brings down destruction, or unhappiness, upon the sinner, had filled the remaining twelve.

The Textual Sermon is one in which the passage of Scrip-

*THEREMIN: Rhetoric, Book I. Chap. X.

ture is broken up, and either its leading words or its leading clauses become the heads of the discourse. For example, Rom. xiv. 12: "So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God," might be the foundation of a discourse upon human accountability. The divisions are formed by emphasizing the leading words, and thereby converting them into the divisions of the sermons as follows: 1. An *account* is to be rendered. 2. This account is to be rendered to *God*. 3. *Every one* is to render this account,—mankind generally. 4. Every one of *us* is to render this account,—men as individuals. 5. Every one of us is to render an account of *himself*.

It is not necessary that the words of the text should be employed, as in the example given above. The substance of the separate clauses may be made the divisions, and the sermon still be textual. Barrows has a sermon founded on Eph. v. 20: "Giving thanks always for all things unto God." The plan is as follows: 1. The duty itself,—giving thanks. 2. The object to whom thanks are to be directed,—to God. 3. The time of performing the duty,—always. 4. The matter and extent of the duty,—for all things.

What are sometimes termed "observational" sermons, are also textual. The following taken from a plan of a sermon by Beddome upon Acts ix. 4: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me," will illustrate this. The observations upon this text are suggested either by the text as a whole, or by some of its parts. 1. It is the general character of unconverted men to be of a persecuting spirit. This character is suggested by the text as a whole. 2. Christ has his eye upon persecutors. This observation is also suggested by the text as a whole. 3. The injury done to Christ's people, Christ considers as done to himself. This observation is suggested by a part of the text,—by an emphasized word in it, "why persecutest thou *me*." 4. The calls of Christ are particular. This observation is suggested by a part of the text,—"*Saul, Saul.*"

There are two things requisite to the production of a good textual sermon, viz: a significant text, and a talent to discover its significance. The text must contain distinct and

emphatic conceptions to serve as the parts of the division. In the text given above, Rom. xiv. 12, "So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God," there are these distinct and emphatic ideas: (a) An account. (b) A Judge. (c) Humanity generally. (d) The individual in particular. (e) Personal confession. These fertile conceptions are full of matter, and the skill of the sermonizer is seen in the thoroughness and brevity with which he exhausts them and their contents. Upon the number, variety, and richness of such distinct and emphatic ideas in a text depends its fitness for textual discourse.

Again, the text, in case it does not contain a number of such conceptions, needs contain a number of distinct positions, or affirmations, to serve as parts of the division. There may be no single conceptions in a text suitable to constitute the plan of a sermon, while there are several statements in it, direct or implied. Take, for example, Ps. xc. 10: "The days of our years are threescore years and ten: and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow: for it is soon cut off, and we fly away." The single conceptions in this text are not weighty enough to constitute heads in a discourse, but the affirmations, the positions, the statements implied in it, are. This text, treated in this way, would furnish the following divisions of a textual sermon: 1. Human life, however lengthened out, must come to an end. 2. Human life, at longest, is very short. 3. That which is added to the ordinary duration of human life is, after all, but little to be desired.

The second requisite in order to the production of a good textual sermon is a talent to detect these emphatic conceptions, or these direct or indirect positions in a passage of Scripture. A preacher destitute of this talent will pass by many texts that really are full of the materials of textual sermonizing. He has no eye to discover the rich veins that lie concealed just under the dull and uninteresting surface. If a text is so plain that he needs only to call out the leading words,—if the formation of the plan is merely a *verbalizing*

process,—he can, perhaps, succeed in constructing a textual discourse that will probably be common-place, because its structure is so very evident and easy. But the number of such texts is small, and the range of such a sermonizer must be narrow. A tact is needed in the preacher to discover the hidden skeleton. This tact will be acquired gradually, and surely, by every one who carefully cultivates himself in all homiletic respects. Like all nice discernment, it comes imperceptibly in the course of training and discipline, and therefore no single and particular rule for its acquisition can be laid down. It must be acquired, however, or the fundamental talent for textual sermonizing will be wanting. Moreover, this tact should be judicious. It is possible to find more meaning in a text than it really contains. The Rabbinic notion, that mountains of sense are contained in every letter of the inspired volume, may be adopted to such an extent, at least, as to lead the preacher into a fanciful method that is destructive of all impressive and effective discourse. This talent for detecting the significance of Scripture must be confined to the gist of it,—to the evident and complete substance of it.

The Expository Sermon, as its name indicates, is an explanatory discourse. The purpose of it is, to unfold the meaning of a connected paragraph or section of Scripture, in a more detailed manner than is consistent with the structure, of either the topical or the textual sermon. Some writers upon Homiletics would deny it a place among sermons, and contend that it cannot legitimately contain enough of the oratorical structure and character to justify its being employed for purposes of persuasion. They affirm that the expository discourse is purely and entirely dialectic, and can no more be classified with the connected and symmetrical productions of oratory and eloquence, than the commentary or the paraphrase can be.

But while it is undoubtedly true that the expository sermon is the farthest removed from the oration, both in its structure and in its movement, it is not necessary that it should be as

totally unoratorical as a piece of commentary, or a paraphrase. An expository discourse should have a logical structure, and be pervaded by a leading sentiment, as really as a topical sermon. And it ought to be certainly free from the dilution of a mere paraphrase. It should have a beginning, middle, and end, and thus be more than a piece of commentary. In short, we lay down the same rule in relation to the expository sermon that we did in relation to the textual: viz, that it be assimilated to the topical model as closely as the nature of the species permits. But in order to this assimilation, it is necessary to select for exposition, a passage, or paragraph of Scripture that is somewhat complete in itself. The distinction between expository preaching and commentary, originates in the selection, in the former instance, of a rounded and self-included portion of inspiration, as the foundation of discourse, while in the latter instance, the mind is allowed to run on indefinitely, to the conclusion of the book or the epistle. The excellence of an expository sermon, consequently, depends primarily upon the choice of such a portion of Scripture as will not lead the preacher on and on, without allowing him to arrive at a proper termination. Unless a passage is taken that finally comes round in a full circle, containing one leading sentiment, and teaching one grand lesson,—like a parable of our Lord,—the expository sermon must either be commentary or paraphrase. And if it be either of these, it cannot be classed among sermons, because the utmost it can accomplish is information. Persuasion, the proper function and distinguishing characteristic of eloquence, forms no part of its effects upon an audience.

Even when a suitable passage has been selected the sermonizer will need to employ his strongest logical talents, and his best rhetorical ability, to impart sufficiently of the oratorical form and spirit to the expository sermon. He will need to watch his mind, and his plan, with great care, lest the discourse overflow its banks, and spread out in all directions, losing the current, and the deep strong volume of eloquence. This species of sermonizing is very liable to have a dilution of

divine truth, instead of an exposition. Perhaps, among modern preachers, Chalmers exhibits the best example of the expository sermon. The oratorical structure and spirit of his mind enabled him to create a current in almost every species of discourse which he undertook, and through his Lectures on Romans we find a strong unifying stream of eloquence constantly setting in, with an increasing and surging force, from the beginning to the end. The expository preaching of this distinguished sacred orator is well worth studying in the respect of which we are speaking.

Having thus briefly sketched characteristics of the three species of sermons, the question naturally arises : To what extent is each to be employed by the preacher?

The first general answer to this question is, that *all* the species should be employed by every sermonizer without exception. No matter what the turn or temper of his mind may be, he should build upon each and every one of these patterns. If he is highly oratorical in his heart and spirit, let him by no means neglect the expository sermon. If his mental temperament is phlegmatic, and his mental processes naturally cool and unimpassioned, let him by no means neglect the topical sermon.

It is too generally the case, that the preacher follows his tendency, and preaches uniformly one kind of sermons. A more severe dealing with his own powers, and a wiser regard for the wants of his audience, would lead to more variety in sermonizing. At times, the mind of the congregation needs the more stirring and impressive influence of a topical discourse, to urge it up to action. At others, it needs the instruction and indoctrination of the less rhetorical, and more didactic expositions of Scripture.

And this leads to the further remark, as a definite reply to the question above raised, that the preacher should employ all three of the species, in the order in which they have been discussed.

Speaking generally, it is safe to say that the plurality of

sermons should be topical,—pervaded by a single idea, or containing a single proposition, and converging by a constant progress to a single point. For this is the model species as we have seen. The textual and the expository sermon must be as closely assimilated to this species as is possible, by being founded upon a single portion of Scripture that is complete in itself, and by teaching one general lesson.

Moreover, textual and expository sermons will not be likely to possess this oratorical structure, and to breathe this eloquent spirit, unless the preacher is in the habit of constructing proper orations,—unless he understands the essential distinctions between eloquence and philosophy,—unless he feels the difference, and makes his audience feel the difference, between the sacred essay and the sacred oration.

Next in order, follows the textual sermon; and this species is next in value for the purposes of persuasion. Easy and natural in its structure,—its parts being either the repetition of Scripture phraseology, or else suggestions from it,—the textual sermon should be frequently employed by the preacher.

And, lastly, the expository sermon should be occasionally employed. There is somewhat less call for this variety, than there was before the establishment of Sabbath-schools and Bible-classes. Were it not that these have taken the exposition of Scripture into their own charge, one very considerable part of the modern preacher's duty—as it was of the Christian Fathers and the Reformers—would be to expound the Bible. Under the present arrangement of the Christian Church, however, the ministry is relieved from this duty to a considerable extent. But it is not wholly relieved from it. It is the duty of the preacher occasionally to lay out his best strength in the production of an elaborate expository sermon—which shall not only do the ordinary work of a sermon, which shall not only instruct, awaken and move, but which shall also serve as a sort of guide and model for the teacher of the Sabbath-school and the Bible-class. Such sermonizing becomes an aid to the instructor in getting at the substance of the Scripture, and in bringing it out before the

minds of the young. Probably the preacher can take no course so well adapted to raise the standard of Sabbath-school and Bible-class instruction in his congregation, as by occasionally delivering a well-constructed and carefully elaborated expository discourse.

By employing, in this manner, all three of the species, in their relation and proper proportions, the preacher will accomplish more for his people, and for his own mind, than by confining himself to one species only. As the years of his minority roll on, he will bring the whole Bible into contact with the hearts and consciences of his audience. Divine revelation will, in this way, become all that it is capable of becoming for the mind of man, because all its elements will be wrought into the mass of society. The preacher himself will perform all his functions, and not a portion only. He will instruct and awaken, he will indoctrinate and enkindle, he will inform and move, he will rebuke, reprove and exhort. In short, he will in this way minister to the greatest variety of wants, and build up the greatest variety and breadth of Christian character in the church.

After this analysis of the different varieties of sermons, we pass, next, to the consideration of their foundation. A sermon is built upon a passage of Scripture, which is denominated a *text*. This term is derived from the Latin *tex tum*, which signifies woven. The text, therefore, etymologically denotes, either a portion of inspiration that is woven into the whole web of holy writ, and which, therefore, must be interpreted in its connection and relations, or else a portion of inspiration that is woven into the whole fabric of the sermon. We need not confine ourselves to either meaning exclusively, but may combine both significations. A text, then, is a passage of inspiration which is woven primarily into the web of Holy Writ, and secondarily into the web of a discourse. By uniting both of the etymological meanings of the word, we are led to observe the two great facts, that the subject of a sermon is an organic part of Scripture, and therefore should not

work ; the Harmony of the Gospels is from Dr. Robinson ; and the Acts of the Apostles and Paul's Epistles are arranged on the authority of Dean Alford. The whole Bible, too, is divided into subjects.

Hymns for the Sick Room. New York: Randolph. 1866. pp. 130. The selections of hymns in this volume are very appropriate for all the exigencies of the sick room. It is a collection of hymns, and not of poems, and it will be found a source of comfort and strength to all who are in sorrow. Texts of Scripture, meditations and prayers are interspersed. Like all of Mr. Randolph's works, this is issued in an attractive style.

The American Sunday School Union has published two excellent works, brought out in good style : *Children's Party ; a Day at Uplands*—a series of short tales and poems for children ; and *Isa Graeme's World*, pp. 360, founded on fact. The latter story is exceedingly well told, and breathes throughout a healthful and elevated religious spirit. Such books cannot fail of doing good to a large circle of readers.

The Presbyterian Publication Committee have added some valuable works to their growing list, among which we note the *Social Hymn Book*, being identical with "The Social Hymn and Tune Book," which has become deservedly popular, (the tunes omitted) to adapt it to the lecture-room, prayer meeting and family. *Dutch Tiles*, or Loving Words about the Saviour. By EMMA S. BABURK. *What to do.* By E. L. LLEWELLYN. *Niff and his Dogs.* And *Black Steve*, or the Strange Warning. By MARTHA FARQUHARSON. The latter a strange and harrowing story of crime and hypocrisy ; the others interesting Sunday-school Books. "What to do" will especially interest the young folks.

Sure Words of Promise ; the Soul-Gatherer ; The Cross of Jesus ; by REV. DANIEL THOMPSON ; and *Plain Words*, by CHARLES JOHN VAUGHAN, D. D. These four neat and tasty volumes (Carlton and Porter) are all on subjects of deep and general interest. Practical in cast, thoroughly evangelical in spirit, earnest and often vigorous in expression, they are books which the Christian may feed upon, and which all classes may read with profit. They are printed on tinted paper, uniform in size and binding, and would be a valuable addition to any Sunday-school library.

Six Months among the Charities of Europe. By JOHN DE LIEFDE. 2 vols. Alexander Strahan : London and New York. 1865. This celebrated English house has established a branch in this city, which brings its numerous publications directly to the notice and within the reach of the American public. The present work is an unpretending yet deeply interesting account of the rise, progress, and glorious results of the leading institutions of Germany, which are engaged in the work of Home Missions. The author spent six months in personally inspecting and acquainting himself with the history of twenty-six of these, and in reference to fifteen of them he gives us the benefit of his labors. He writes not in the spirit of criticism, but in full sympathy with the agencies and actors of whom he writes. The Institutions described are : The Deaconess House, at Kaiserwerth ; Father Zeller's School, at Beuggen ; The Deacon House, at Duisburg ; The Asylum for Discharged Prisoners and Neglected Men, at Lintorf ; The Establishment for Indigent Children, at Newhof ; The Asylum for Poor Children, at Disselthat, and at Neukirchen ; The Orphan House, at Lahr-Dinglingen ; Pastor Heldring and his Establishments, near Hemmen ; Agricultural Colony, at Rijssett ; The Blind School, at Ilzarah ; The Agricultural Colon, at Sainte Foy ; Establishment of M. Bost, at Laforce ; and The Deaconess Institution, in

Paris. The history of some of these, as here simply related, brings out the power of faith and prayer, and the efficiency of individual effort when nobly directed, in a most wonderful manner. This Inner Mission work has been of inestimable worth to the States of Germany during the last fifty years, the first great necessity for which was made painfully manifest by the wars of Napoleon, filling the land with widows and orphan children: it has done much to counteract the spirit of Rationalism and to revive the Evangelical faith and life there.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

Social Life of the Chinese. By REV. JUSTUS DOOLITTLE. With one hundred and fifty engravings. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1866. The author of this valuable work on China spent fourteen years, as a missionary, at Fuhchau, in the service of the American Board. He has therefore enjoyed the best of opportunities to acquaint himself with the inner life of this peculiar people; and we hesitate not to say that since the appearance of Williams' Middle Kingdom, "no work on China equals this in the amount of exact and reliable information which it gives as to the customs, opinions, social life, and religious belief and practices of this singular people. A large part of the contents of these volumes originally appeared, in 1861-4, in the *Chinal Mail*, a newspaper published at Hong Kong. On his return to this country, Mr. D. was strongly urged by many of the most intelligent residents of China (English and American) to republish them in this country. The only regret is that the author could not have found the time to subject them to a more thorough and careful revision, and a systematic arrangement, which would have greatly added to the interest and value of the mass of facts which are here gathered up. But even in its present state, the work is a highly important contribution to a better understanding of that ancient, anomalous and little understood nation. The numerous illustrations, chiefly derived from photographic views, and from pen and ink sketches drawn by Chinese artists, are not the least novel and interesting feature of the work.

Thirty Years of Army Life on the Border. By COL. R. B. MARCY. New York: Harpers. 1866. pp. 452. This volume is handsomely got up, and fully illustrated, and contains vigorous and attractive accounts of Indian life upon the western plains; a trip across the Rocky Mountains in winter; descriptions of rare plants and animals; striking incidents from the lives of officers and army men and frontier men. It is a very interesting volume.

Shakspeare's Delineations of Insanity, Imbecility and Suicide. By A. O. KELLOGG, M. D. New York: Hurd and Houghton. 1866. pp. 204. Dr. Kellogg's experience as physician in the State Lunatic Asylum, Utica, N. Y., is turned to good account in this valuable criticism of Shakspeare. It illustrates by ample citations the great dramatist's acquaintance with the abnormal mental states; and shows that treatment of these diseases which is confirmed by modern science.

Esperance. By META LANDER. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1866. pp. 336. The author of this novel is favorably known by her previous works, "Marion Graham," etc. The aim of *Esperance* is to show how a true religious faith can be maintained under the most trying temptations, and to illustrate its influence over even the most abandoned. The author shows, especially in the more simple scenes and characters, de-

281

Are ada
Dress-M
Hats, Ca
work eq
They wi
making

A O

There
Warrant
ing-Mach
number
Machine
for \$55.
history
This
to use f
the first
learned

In 185
my own
1856 we
with us,
to Iowa
I run
fourteen
crenna
and w
three ti
with m
by bac
leather
for No.
It is
the Wh
Machin

Time
test, C
time le

I
these

T

with
with

WHEELER & WILSON'S

LOCK-STITCH

PRINT IN BINDING

SEWING-MACHINES,

No. 625 Broadway, New-York,

Are adapted to all kinds of Family Sewing, Army Clothing, and to the use of Seamstresses, Dress-Makers, Tailors, Manufacturers of Shirts, Collars, Skirts, Cloaks, Mantillas, Clothing, Hats, Caps, Corsets, Ladies' Boots and Shoes, Linen Goods, Umbrellas, Parasols, etc. They work equally well upon silk, linen, woolen, and cotton goods, with silk, cotton, or linen thread. They will seam, quilt, gather, hem, fell, cord, braid, bind, and perform every species of sewing, making a beautiful and perfect stitch, alike on both sides of the article sewed.

The QUALITIES which recommend them are:

1. *Beauty and excellence of stitch alike on both sides of the fabric sewed.*
2. *Strength, firmness, and durability of seam, that will not rip nor ravel.*
3. *Economy of thread.*
4. *Attachments and wide range of application to purposes and materials.*
5. *Compactness and elegance of model and finish.*
6. *Simplicity and thoroughness of construction.*
7. *Speed, ease of operation and management, and quietness of movement.*

A CURIOSITY FOR THE LADIES.

There is on exhibition at the salesrooms of Messrs. WHEELER & WILSON, No. 625 Broadway, the first Sewing-Machine (No. 1) made by that Company, the present business being 220,000. Let the interested compare the Machine sold in 1851 for \$125 with those now offered for \$65. The former owner of this Machine gives its history as follows:

This Machine was finished early in 1851, and I learned its use from Mr. WILSON himself. I was thus, you see, the first to work the Wheeler & Wilson Machine, and learned on the first Machine they ever manufactured.

In 1854 I earned with the Machine \$295, besides doing my own housework and taking care of my baby. In 1856 we came to Davenport, and brought the Machine with us. I believe it is the first Machine ever brought to Iowa.

I run that Machine almost constantly for more than fourteen years, on all sorts of work, from the finest dressmaking to the heaviest tailoring. I quilted a full-sized white bed-spread with it which has been exhibited three times at the Fair. It took me three weeks to do it with any other work; but it could not have been done by hand in so many years. I have even stitched leather with it, and at the time I exchanged it, (in 1865,) for No. 139,320, it worked just as well as when made.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to add that I believe the Wheeler & Wilson to be vastly superior to any other Machine made. Yours respectfully, F. E. R.

Time tries all things. Use only furnishes the final test. Opinions of the skillful may be of value, but time is needed to confirm them. All failures have had

their advocates. It is noteworthy that the Sewing-Machine for which the highest premium was awarded at the World's Fair here in 1859 long since sunk into merited oblivion. The past fifteen years have seen numerous Machines, with high-sounding pretensions, rise with a flourish, confound the simple, and vanish. So will it be while credulity lasts.

The Wheeler & Wilson Company fixed upon the "Lock-Stitch" as the one best suited to the general purposes of sewing, for beauty, permanence, elasticity, and economy of thread, and experience has confirmed the preference. It was at liberty, then as now, to make a chain-stitch machine; and even now, at a cost of less than 10 cents each, can adapt its Lock-Stitch Machine to make the chain-stitch as well as the lock-stitch; but, not believing in the stitch, has steadily refused to give it any kind of indorsement.

While this Company has given to the public the best fruits of inventive genius, it has guarded it from a multitude of traps. Attachments have been added for various purposes, as hemming, blindstitch, braiding, cording, etc., but it has been kept free of all useless complications. *Simplicity of parts*, and adaptation to the widest range of work, has been the constant aim. Instead of boasting of a variety of useless stitches and movements, it claims to make but *one kind of stitch*, and that with the *fewest movements possible*. Hence the Machine may run constantly for fourteen years, like the No. 1 above mentioned, or a lifetime even, and work just as well as when new. With a complication of parts and movements, it would require monthly repairs and adjustments. As the purchase of a Sewing-Machine is, or may be, as not for a lifetime, care should be had in getting what time and see have approved.--*Am. Advertiser.*

By special arrangements with Messrs. WHEELER & WILSON, we are able to offer one of these superb Machines, costing \$55, for

Twenty Subscribers to Hours at Home, (\$60.)

As the Work is new and highly popular, and a new year begins with this number, (May) with greatly increased attractions, it is a favorable time to secure one of these family helps without cost.

PUBLISHERS HOURS AT HOME

654 Broadway, New York.

The American PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, For 1866.

The Presbyterian Quarterly Review, published in Philadelphia from 1852, and *The American Theological Review*, published in New York from 1859, were united in January, 1863, under the title: *The American Presbyterian and Theological Review*. Its editors are Professor Henry B. Smith, of the Union Theological Seminary, and Rev. J. M. Sherwood, aided by Rev. Albert Barnes, and Thomas Brainerd, D.D., of Philadelphia, and Professors R. D. Hitchcock, T. B. Condit, and George E. Day.

This *Review* was recommended by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, 1863, in the following terms:

"Being under the editorial control of several of the most distinguished ministers in our connection, representing various sections and institutions, and in the full confidence, from the numbers already issued, the pledges given, and the talent enlisted in it, that it will be true to the principles and ably serve the cause of our denomination, this General Assembly takes pleasure in commending it to the patronage of our ministers and churches."

The Presbyterian Clerical Association of New York City, spoke of it as "distinguished by a catholic spirit, a high and liberal scholarship, and a wise advocacy of the polity and genius of that Church it so ably represents."

It is the only Quarterly Review published in our church. It has been widely commended by the journals of other denominations as well as by our own, and by the secular press.

The New York Evangelist: "For those who have only the means to procure a single one of our quarters, we know of no single Review of equal value." *The New York Observer*: "It is an honor to the church, a source of instruction and of religious and intellectual culture and enjoyment to her ministers." *The Christian Intelligencer*: "It is conducted with equal ability, and deserves a catholic support." *The New York Times*: "The criticisms on books are acute and outspoken." "The Theological and Literary Intelligencer shows a wider range of information than any other Review in the country." *The New York Tribune*: "Some of the most able and effective expositions of the principles for which the American people are contending in arms have been contributed by the principal editors to the common cause."

While this *Review* represents the principles of the Presbyterian Churches, it devotes a large space to topics of general interest in Theology and Philosophy, especially to the relations of the Bible and Christianity to science and speculation. No *Review* in the country has an abler corps of contributors; they represent seven different denominations. Among them, besides its editors and associate editors, are Professors Thomas H. Skinner, D.D.; W. G. T. Shedd, D.D.; Philip Schaff, D.D., of New York; Drs. Hickok, and Tayler Lewis, of Union College; Drs. William Adams, E. F. Hatfield, G. L. Prentiss, E. O. Wines, E. H. Gillett, Howard Crosby, Henry Darling, C. P. Wing, H. Harbaugh, Elias Riggs; Presidents D. R. Goodwin, Francis Wayland, S. W. Fisher, and J. F. Tuttle; Professors W. S. Tyler, Noah Porter, George P. Fisher, and Egbert C. Smyth; Hon. Elcazar Lord, J. A. Van Heuvel, Esq., G. S. Camp, Esq., and many others. It has also given translations of important essays by the German Professors, Julius Müller, Dorner, Hupfeld, Erdmann, Delitzsch, and Laurent, and from the French of Laboulaye, R. St. Hilaire, Hauréau, and Saisset. Its aim is to keep its readers abreast with the biblical, theological, and philosophical investigation of the times. Its conductors have made arrangements for increasing its value and usefulness.

With the number for January, 1866, this *Review* begins the fourth volume of the New Series. Though the expense of publishing has been nearly doubled, its price is not advanced. Its circulation is now equal to that of any religious quarterly in the country, with perhaps a single exception. But it can be well maintained only by an increase in the number of its subscribers. Its conductors appeal with confidence to the ministers and laymen of our church to help them in this work. It should be sent to all our Home and Foreign Missionaries. It is sent to such at cost price (\$2 50) so far as means are furnished.

The *Review* is issued quarterly in New York and Philadelphia.

TERMS.—\$3 00, strictly in advance; \$3 50 within three months, or when received through agents; \$4 00 at the end of the year; \$2 50 for Missionaries and Theological Students.

The back volumes bound, and in numbers, for sale.

Address J. M. Sherwood, box 1,383, P. O., New York.